

AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. ³²~~XXXII~~.—JANUARY AND FEBRU-
ARY, 1880.

THE CHURCH'S MISSION OF RECONCILIATION.

I cannot resist the conviction that a special mission of reconciliation now presents itself to the PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH. This conviction is the result of a consideration of certain peculiarities of our own time, and of the attitude in regard to these peculiarities which this Church is capable of assuming. These peculiarities it is not difficult to recognize. They are for the most part the results of a transition in society from an old to a new order of things. At no period in the history of the world has there been so eager and persistent a questioning of everything that claims authority over the human mind, and such restlessness under established institutions. The process so far has been chiefly disintegrating and destructive. The great conservative and constructive forces upon which the welfare of society depends have not yet specially asserted themselves. To the mind which has well considered the divine purpose as it has unfolded itself in history, there are openings in the clouds through which we can catch glimpses of the light of

the coming order and peace; there are many voices which promise the final reconciliation of the antagonisms which now disquiet the world. But the prevailing aspect is that of confusion, uncertainty and doubt; and venerable institutions of Church and State, and old opinions and philosophies, and ancient modes of faith seem to be shaken to their very foundations.

It is impossible that this state of things can long continue. The human mind very soon rebels against a mere negative condition; and positive institutions and beliefs, of some kind, are sure to emerge from the present dreary waste. The problem which presents itself, and is sure to be more or less satisfactorily solved, is to discriminate between what is transient and what is permanent in human life and society; to determine what can safely be thrown aside as dangerous or obsolete, and what must be retained as essential; what are the mere fleeting prejudices of mankind, and what are, if there are any such, immutable and eternal truths.

There is a phenomenon, in our time, which is well worthy of our consideration, and that is a tendency to a return to the Church of Rome. I do not now refer to the Tractarian and Ritualistic movement, however much that may have brought about a different feeling in regard to some of the peculiarities of that Church. I refer now to a sympathy which is springing up for the Church of Rome in quarters where perhaps it would least be expected, and where its existence is of very great significance. No one can have failed to notice the altered tone, of late years, in regard to this subject. The bitterness of earlier controversies seems in a great measure to have passed away. Educated men generally are inclined to admit that the Church of Rome has played an important part in history, in the preservation of civilization and in the maintenance of a spiritual order in society. Political considerations, especially in Germany, are bringing about a different attitude towards the Papacy. Prince Bismarck seeks the alliance of his old enemies against new and more dangerous foes. The policy of Leo

XIII. seems to be likely to be conciliatory, and to adapt itself to some of the most deeply felt wants of the age. There are many men who are tired of mere individualism, are oppressed with the confusion in which free inquiry has resulted, and, in the reaction which has followed, long for some venerable authority to which they can submit themselves. In this state of mind they welcome the most astounding claims of the Church of Rome. If science has driven them, as they think, to a doubt of immortality and a denial of the possibility of knowledge of God, then, in despair of finding a religion which can be reconciled with reason, they embrace one which proudly sets reason at defiance. And more than this, there are timid men, in all our churches, who, distrusting their own conclusions and alarmed at the confusion which prevails, are glad to recognize a great institution which claims to think for them, and demands of them only that they shall believe and obey. Various influences combine to give strength to a movement which tends towards authority, unity, and positiveness in religious institutions. The certain end of such a movement, unless it can find itself elsewhere satisfied, is in the Church of Rome.

What is needed, in order to meet most beneficently the peculiar wants of the present day is the authority which belongs to catholic truth and historical continuity in an institution which is in sympathy with freedom and progress; which encourages scientific inquiry; which recognizes the right and responsibility of private judgment; and which testifies, with no doubtful voice, to the fundamental truths of a personal God, a divine and redeeming Christ, and a personal immortality for man.

It is a principle common to all forms of Christianity, outside of the Church of Rome, that there is not and cannot be any visible head of the Church on earth. The idea therefore of an universal empire, with any one on earth representing the headship of Christ, is that very feature of the Papal system which all the rest of Christendom rejects.

The reconciliation of the non-Christian elements in Society to Christianity, and of the Christian elements into a new unity would naturally, therefore, take form in national Churches, with a common faith and rites of worship, and in communion with each other.

One of the most striking features in the history of Christianity has been the existence of national establishments, constituted by a union of Church and State. The tendency in our own time is strongly in the direction of disestablishment and the independence of all relations of the State on the one hand, and the Church on the other. Whether this is to be a permanent tendency, or whether it is altogether a salutary one, may be a question. There are many indications that the tendency may be indefinitely resisted by the Church of England. And when we remember the grand history of that institution and see how it has its roots everywhere in the social and domestic life of the people, and how beneficently it is now gathering all the best interests of the nation under its protecting shade, we cannot regard its preservation as a national establishment otherwise than with gratitude and joy. But where established Churches do not exist, there is no present prospect that they ever will exist. Relations which were formerly compulsory are more and more becoming voluntary, and Churches in the future, if they are to become in any sense National, must become so because they are the best expression of the religious life of the nation and are accepted by the people as such.

I am proceeding on the supposition that the mission of reconciliation cannot be satisfactorily accomplished, that is, that modern thought and progress cannot be reconciled with Christianity, and different forms of Christianity cannot be reconciled with each other, unless our Protestant Christendom is unified upon the basis of the historic faith, and organized into institutions which in the sense already laid down shall be National Churches.

It is vain to say that the same power can be secured and the same desirable results accomplished by the co-existence

of various societies, independent of each other, and each claiming to present some special aspect of Christianity. When we consider what the religion of Christ is, the attitude of these various Christian bodies towards each other presents a deplorable spectacle. The work of the Church of Christ in the world is carried on at the most tremendous disadvantage and with the most needless sacrifice of influence and means. It is probably no exaggeration to say that as much of the energy of Christian men is absorbed in attacking other forms of Christianity and defending their own, as in efforts for the conversion of the world. It is time that this condition of things should come to an end, and that men should labor for some form of Christianity which shall win to itself the allegiance of Christian people and become, not by civil compulsion, but by voluntary acceptance, the Church of the nation.

The highest ideal of the Church of the future is, of course, the manifestation to the world of the organic unity of all Christian people. When we speak of "organic unity" we mean, of course, the unity which belongs to and is manifested by a body animated by one vitalizing principle. This is true, to some extent, of the Church regarded as the "blessed company of all faithful people." But this unity is comparatively powerless because there is little consciousness of it in the body itself, and because there is almost an entire absence of any external manifestation. This divided and segregated state in which there is so little consciousness or manifestation of unity is the result of wrong opinions, wrong feelings and lack of spiritual directness and power. It has been profoundly said that "vice separates men, while virtue unites them," and it is the "vice" of the Christian community, that is, the defective moral and spiritual sense, which keeps the faithful in Christ Jesus from the aspiration after and realization of unity.

I have said that this organic unity of all Christian people is the highest ideal of the Church of the future. The full realization of this in the sense of any manifestation of unity, including all the great branches into which Christendom is

divided is so remote from any present indications as hardly to encourage any practical effort. But the opportunity certainly lies open to us to labor for reconciliation and unity, with confident hopes of success within certain limits, and in certain relations which we are abundantly able to reach and affect. It may be well at the same time to remember that the larger realization of an all-embracing unity, has been regarded by some of the profoundest thinkers of this century, as something to be directly labored for, and the Anglican Church as the great agency by which it is to be accomplished. Most remarkable in this respect is the testimony of Count Joseph De Maistre, one of the most celebrated writers of the ultramontane school in the Church of Rome. Notwithstanding the natural prejudices of his ecclesiastical position, he says in his "*Considerations sur la France*," that if Christians are to be drawn together, it would seem that the impulse must proceed from the Church of England.¹ With such a testimony, from such a source, it may not be unsuitable for us to feel that there is confided to the Protestant Episcopal Church, which has the same faith and order as the Church of England, a special mission of reconciliation in our own land and a special agency in the building up of the future Church of the nation.

Perhaps the first aspect of this work of reconciliation is suggested by the alienation of many intellectual and educated men from Christianity. Very much that might be

¹ "Si jamais les Chrétiens se rapprochent, comme tout les y invite, il semble que la motion doit partir de l'église d'Angleterre. Le presbytérienisme fut une œuvre française, et par conséquent une œuvre exagérée. Nous sommes trop éloignés des sectateurs d'un culte trop peu substantiel; il n'y a pas moyen de nous entendre. Mais l'église anglicane, qui nous touche d'une main, touche de l'autre ceux que nous ne pouvons toucher; et quoique, sous un certain point de vue, elle soit en butte aux coups des deux partis, et qu'elle présente le spectacle un peu ridicule d'un révolté qui prêche l'obéissance, cependant elle est très-précieuse sous d'autres aspects, et peut être considérée comme un de ces intermédiaires chimiques, capables de rapprocher des éléments inassociables de leur nature."

Considerations sur La France, Par M. Le Cte. Jph. De Maistre.

said on this point would apply to the whole Christian body as well as to any one particular Church, but there are certain respects in which I think our own Church will be seen to possess special advantages for the discharge of this mission.

It is undoubtedly true that there are many minds, at the present day, alienated from Christianity, not from aversion to its moral or spiritual principles, but on account of certain intellectual difficulties with which it is embarrassed. One of these difficulties which is most widely felt and most injurious in its results is that which arises from the supposed impossibility of verifying those facts which lie at the foundation of Christianity, such as the being of a personal God, the supernatural character of redemption in Christ, and the personal immortality of man. Modern habits in the investigation of truth, the employment of the inductive method; the invariable use of verification in scientific inquiry, have led to the denial of the character of knowledge to any conclusions except those to which these methods have led. As a natural consequence men will say: "All this that you claim in regard to religion may be true. It is impossible, perhaps, to disprove it, but on the other hand it is impossible to prove it, and we cannot be asked to assert our belief in regard to a subject of which we have no knowledge, and are incompetent, therefore, either to affirm or deny." This agnosticism, this denial of the possibility of any knowledge of the infinite and the absolute stands, therefore, an apparently insuperable barrier to the simplest and most fundamental conceptions in religion.

The removal of this difficulty and the reconciliation of such men to Christianity must be accomplished by different methods from those too often employed. To meet this agnosticism by fierce denunciation and a denial to it of any rational or legitimate character; to treat those who avow it as if they were morally bad as well as intellectually astray, is a mistake of the most dangerous character. There is a certain truth in this position, which if we are bold and honest we shall not fail to recognize. To recognize it boldly

and honestly is the first step towards the removal of the difficulty by which it is attended.

Suppose then that we have recognized the value of the scientific method, and admitted that the purely intellectual processes by which it is sought to establish the fundamental principles of religion are not followed by the same kind of assurance that attends a result in the physical sciences reached by the inductive method. Suppose further that we have admitted that until some satisfactory method for the removal of the difficulty is pointed out, the agnostic position does not seem to be altogether irrational. We are then prepared to take a ground where we can secure for religion all the certitude to be desired, and from which it is impossible that we can be dislodged.

For when we have admitted all this, which we are honestly bound to admit, we can assert without fear of reasonable denial, that certitude is possible in regard to certain matters where verification is impossible; that in certain respects where we cannot verify we are bound to believe, and that the fundamental principles of religion are of this character. Take, for instance, our certitude in regard to the actual existence of a past, such as we remember it, or as it has been certified to us by the memory of others. This is a conclusion which has not been reached by the inductive method. It is not susceptible of verification, and yet we are compelled to believe it by the very structure of our minds. The same is true of the fact of our personal identity and of the continuity of nature. A certainty which excludes the possibility of doubt is not attainable even by the scientific method. It is simply a conviction engendered by a very high degree of probability. Just such a sort of probability attaches itself to the fundamental principles of religion. The universal tendency of the mind to believe in these invests them with a very high degree of probability. But then further than this, the testimony of certain faculties of our nature, which are most valuable in the search after this class of truths, contributes to the certitude we seek. The moral

sense, which is a fact as much as any other, demands this result, and those affections which the moral sense declares to be the best and noblest element in us, when allowed to exercise their influence upon the mind, lead to these fundamental principles of religion.

This brings us to a point of great practical importance in the consideration of this subject. We have found that there is a kind of certitude which is intuitive in its character. We intuitively believe in the reality of our past, in our personal identity at different times, and in the continuity of nature. We have similar intuitions in regard to the fundamental principles of religion, but with this difference, that in the case of religion there is the added testimony of the moral sense and the affections. Thus the existence of a personal God, with the attribute of infinite goodness, is probably not susceptible of proof by the scientific method; but we have an intuitive conviction of its truth, and in a state of the affections which the moral sense pronounces to be good, we believe it as a matter of course.

This ministry of the affections, in the search for truth, has deeply impressed the minds of the profoundest philosophers. Pascal has beautifully said:

"Divine things are infinitely above nature, and God only can place them in the soul. He has designed that they should pass from the heart into the head, and not from the head into the heart, and so as it is necessary to know human things in order to love them, it is necessary to love divine things in order to know them."

The same truth has been gracefully expressed by the present Archbishop of Dublin, when he says,

"To halls of heavenly truth admission wouldst thou win?
Oft knowledge stands without, while love may enter in."

These ideas, I am aware, have given rise, in some cases, to an extravagant mystical theology, but foreign as the whole system of mysticism is to our present mode of thinking, there is good reason to believe that the mystical apprehension of truth is an essential element in a complete system of philosophy, and that, while a theology founded

merely upon intellect and logic, or merely upon feeling and intuition, will be defective, one that is wisely compounded of both elements will be symmetrical and complete in the harmony and fulness of truth.

We may depend upon it that this age, hard and materialistic as it is, is just in a condition to respond to this presentation of the ministry of the affections in the apprehension of truth. Frederick Robertson, with his acute sense of what is most profound in human nature, says that

Men find a relief from the materialism to which they feel themselves compelled in science, in the mystical element in the poetry of Tennyson and Browning. Show men that there are paths of sentiment and affection which lead to heritages of truth, assured to them by Catholic consent and tradition, as divinely communicated to the world, and many a choice spirit will be won from the darkness of doubt and unbelief, and reconciled to faith in God, in Christ and the eternal life.

The attitude of the clergy in reference to the results of scientific inquiry is of very great importance in this connection. Men, for the most part, receive their impressions of Christianity from the representations of the clergy, and thus Christianity is oftentimes held responsible for the misapprehensions of its advocates. The clergy, as a class, are exceedingly averse to any modifications of their views of truth, not unnaturally perhaps confounding their views of truth with truth itself. It is too often forgotten that theology is a progressive science; that while there is no change in the facts upon which it is based, there is a very great change in the mode in which those facts are apprehended and expressed. One of the principal agencies by which this modification and change are brought about is scientific investigation, and its result in a knowledge of the works of God. This knowledge renders certain theological views, which formerly were held without disquietude, absolutely unendurable. Happily the dogmatic statements of the Church, which are to be regarded as practically unchangeable, are

very few and relate only to the fundamental facts of the Christian religion. All doctrinal statements outside of the doctrinal basis of the Church, however logically they may seem to be deduced from it, are properly liable to modification in each age. The discoveries which each generation makes as to the facts and laws of nature, the more thorough knowledge of history, the study of comparative philology and theology, all furnish us with keys to various treasure-houses of divine truth. They open to us new revelations of the being and attributes of God. The recognition of this, and an attitude of encouragement towards the freest scientific inquiry, would do much to remove those prejudices of scientific men towards Christianity which are the result of the prejudices of Christian men against science.

I feel no hesitation in urging, in the interest of Christianity, the encouragement of the freest scientific inquiry. No scientific conclusions, be they true or false, so long as they are confined within the admitted sphere of science, can impugn any statement of the universal creeds. When the man of science says that he studies nature without any preconceived ideas of how it came to exist, or what is its purpose, if it has any purpose, we say 'Very well, we are satisfied with that. All that we ask is that you shall give us the results of your observation and the benefit of your experience in the co-ordination of facts.' When he says further: 'I find in matter all the promise and potency of life'—we are very far from being alarmed as if he had discovered that the idea of God might now be dispensed with. We do not need to ask, for every mind will ask for itself, How did there come to be there this promise and potency of life? He may go on and say: 'I find nothing else there.' 'Very well,' we reply; 'what did you expect to find, or what do you suppose we expected you to find? You do not think, do you, that we are disappointed because you did not find God there? Do you not know that it is a fundamental principle in Christian philosophy that you will not find God in any or all phenomena of the natural world? Go to the full

extent of your scientific methods—they will not lead you out of nature into the spiritual and infinite world. Affirm this to your heart's content, and we will reëcho your affirmation. But if you go further and say that the scientific method is the only one which leads to knowledge and truth, and since it does not disclose God, therefore there is no God, or, at all events, it is impossible for us to know that there is, then we reply: Now you have gone beyond the sphere of science, and have entered a domain which is not peculiarly your own. We have gone with you through all your scientific investigations. We are ready to admit all your conclusions. We do not care how great are the modifications which it may oblige us to make in our doctrinal views of anything within the sphere of nature. But you have gone as far with the scientific method as it is possible for you to go. Now listen for a moment while we venture to speak of that which is inscrutable in and through nature. You have taught us wonderful truths about nature. You have not only made us understand better its marvellous beauty, but you have shown us that it is the embodiment of types, ideas and orderly progression. We have learned of you that it is "saturated with thought," and answers strangely to powers of perception and classification in ourselves. Now is it not reasonable to admit that this constitution of nature gives probability to that conviction of which the human mind has in some way possessed itself, that there is an infinite mind of which nature is the manifestation? Are there not universal beliefs and aspirations which in this way find a rational explanation? Does it not enable you to give a more probable account than otherwise of conscience and the moral sense—and, as what we claim to be the facts of redemption present themselves side by side with the admitted facts of consciousness and experience, is there not such a satisfactory completeness and symmetry in the whole theory of nature and life, thus elaborated, as to make it a guiding principle of our being?

A more wise and just attitude towards scientific theories which seem to militate against certain supposed truths of revelation would do much toward reconciling men of science with the Christian faith. These theories are, some at least of them, rapidly passing into universally accepted statements of facts. It would be well to remember that Christian men have had cause enough to regret their hasty opposition to theories which they have supposed to be irreconcilable with revelation, but which they have subsequently been compelled to admit to be true. This has been the case conspicuously with Astronomy and Geology, and the result has been a more rational Theism. It would not be any stranger if some theory of Evolution, towards which scientific investigation is at present so persistently tending, should be finally established, and as a result nature should come to be regarded, not as proceeding from isolated creative acts, but as the product of an uninterrupted and all pervading divine process and agency. The effect, instead of being to remove God in our idea of Him further from nature, would be to bring Him nearer to our wondering apprehension and awe.

These thoughts in regard to the reconciliation of science to Christianity lead to a grand and most encouraging view of the ministry of science in God's providential government of the world. Men who devote themselves to the study of nature are laying broad and deep foundations for a structure the form and purpose of which, for the most part, they little understand. Upon these foundations they are rearing walls with giant piers and buttresses. Within are innumerable fair and majestic forms, flooded with unimaginable splendors of light. But here is a magnificent structure which it is impossible for them to finish. The crowning glory must come from other hands. It is the power of Christ alone which shall lift a Pantheon into the sky as the fitting dome of a structure made sacred by the works and word of God. For it is true of this structure also, that it is Christ "in whom the whole building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord."

One of the most important problems of reconciliation that presents itself to our Church in this day, is that which is involved in the relations we sustain to other Christian bodies outside of the Church of Rome. These bodies, for the most part, trace their history as organized institutions back to the period of the Reformation; some of them claiming to have existed in more or less distinct form since the Apostolic Age. Without stopping now to consider the question whether episcopacy is essential to the being of a Church, it may be well for us, at the outset, to recognize the fact that there are Christian communions with whom we stand in very close relations, who are to be regarded as holding essentially the doctrines of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; as having the sacraments in their essential features, as retaining something at least of the original organization and government of the Church, and as exhibiting their Christian faith in lives of devotion and works of charity. There are many, no doubt, who hold that the differences between these Christian bodies and our own Church are of minor importance, and there are others who exaggerate these differences, and regard them as making the line of division between that which possesses and that which is destitute of the essential elements of the Church. There are, however, many very thoughtful men in our time, and among them the well known Dr. Goulburn, Dean of Norwich, who has presented his views very forcibly in his book on the Holy Catholic Church, who hold that whatever may be the defects of organization in those Christian bodies, which retain substantially the Nicene faith, they are to be regarded as having acquired legitimacy by existing for so long a period, and as constituting therefore integral parts of the Christian commonwealth.

There are also among us, those who believe strongly in the dependence of Christian life upon the sacraments and ordinances of the Church, and who, therefore, from the admitted piety prevailing in these Christian bodies infer the possession on their part of legitimate rites and ordi-

nances. This is a position which combines high sacramentarian views with broad views of the ministry and the Church.

It should be remembered that whatever may be the exclusive views of individuals, the Churches of the Anglican communion have never restrained liberty of opinion within the limits here indicated. No one view or doctrine, therefore, in regard to this subject can be imposed as obligatory upon the members of the Church.

Amid this allowable diversity of opinion, for which we have reason to be devoutly thankful, it may, perhaps be found that there are more possibilities of unity of feeling and action than we have been accustomed to suppose. It is certainly desirable, at all events, that there should be a careful reconsideration of all the bearings of our attitude in regard to this subject.

If it is simply a question of the unconditional surrender of all these Christian bodies and the adoption of the institutions of the Church as we have received it; if these societies are utterly without legitimacy, and have nothing which they can usefully contribute to the Church of the future, then it necessarily follows that there is no attitude possible for us but that of unqualified hostility, united with the astounding claim, on our part, that instead of being simply one of the fragments (perhaps the nearest to the original type), into which our common Christianity has been unhappily divided, we alone are the representatives of the Church of Christ in this land, and upon us the whole responsibility of Christian institutions rests. For it will hardly be claimed that we share this representative position and responsibility with the Church of Rome, in a sense in which we do not share them with other Christian bodies. The claim that the Church of Rome stands in any closer relations to us than orthodox Protestant Churches is fatal to our own position as a Church. It yields so much to Rome, that it takes away from us all justification for separate existence. If then we claim a right to exist inde-

pendently of Rome, and yet share no representative position and responsibility with any of the Protestant Churches, we do assert for ourselves the prerogative, and assume for ourselves the tremendous obligations of being the only Church of Christ in this land. It is not too much to say that any theory must be fatally defective which leads to so preposterous a conclusion.

In avoiding such a conclusion we shall find that there is very important common ground upon which we, with the non-episcopal Churches can stand. The pressure of the Church of Rome, upon modern society, will make a closer union among Christians, not within its pale, imperatively necessary. It is time that we carefully considered, not so much the points in which we differ, as those in which we agree. Especially is it desirable that we should ascertain the original points of divergence, and what elements of the original Church have been carried on in the various forms into which it has been divided. It is the wise advice of Lord Bacon, in regard to the reformation of Church or State, to revert to their original institution, and see wherein they have departed from the fundamental principles of their organization. This method of reform in the Church is historical, and regards the Church as an organization, with the germs of its future development present in it from the first. Its true growth must therefore be in the direction of germinal development. Its whole past must be carried forward into its future.

The present embarrassments which stand in the way of the organic unity of the Church consist mainly in the existence of several ecclesiastical polities, supposed to be antagonistic to each other. These polities are, in general terms, the Congregational, the Presbyterian and the Episcopal. In examining the essential peculiarities of these organizations, we shall find that they all existed contemporaneously in the early Church. The fundamental principle of Congregationalism is the independence of the Church in a particular place, the right of believers, in a town

or city, which was the original parish or diocese, to regulate their own worship and administer their own affairs. This was certainly true of the original diocese in the primitive Church. The fundamental principle of Presbyterianism is the parity of the presbytery, but it is a parity which admits, in its original idea, of a "primus inter pares"—which approaches very closely to the idea of Episcopacy, for many not only in the Church of England but in the Church of Rome, have held that a bishop does not belong to a different order, but simply holds a higher office than his brother presbyters in the Church. The essential element in episcopacy is the office of a bishop, succeeding to that office, by an unbroken succession, to whom is committed the general superintendence of the diocese over which he presides, and to whom certain functions exclusively belong.

Now suppose, and the supposition is made, not because it suggests anything which may be practicable or desirable, at present, but simply in order to show what common elements there are in these various organizations, suppose, I say, that the modern diocese should come to be reduced to the primitive model, and comprise only the Church in a single city and its suburbs; suppose the principle of a larger diocesan independence were recognized; suppose that one among the presbyters were set apart for life, in conformity to a law of succession, to a particular office of superintendence, we should have a Church, episcopal in its polity, and yet comprising the essential elements of congregationalism and presbyterianism. The old catholicity of organism would be restored.

Without urging this point beyond a mere suggestion of these common features of organization, I wish to say a word in regard to a matter which is of very great importance to us and to the non-episcopal churches. I refer to the widening chasm, in our modern times, between the State and the Church. This tendency is fast rendering a Christian State, as such, impossible. It has originated, in

great measure, in the fact that the Church, in our time, is, as a unit, invisible. It is a body the outlines of which are indefinite. It is wanting in organization. It can come into no relations, as an organism, with civil society. In the present imperfect catholicity of the Church it is impossible for the State to enter into relations with it. They would be relations merely with some fragments or one-sided developments of Christianity. It is not so much hostility on the part of the State to the Church which is leading everywhere to a separation between the two, but the difficulty of ascertaining what is the common, universal Christianity, what is the Catholic Church.

Until there is the development of a higher catholicity this tendency is inevitable. It will, in all probability, proceed in our own country and the other countries of Christendom until every tie of union between the State and ecclesiastical organizations is sundered. The Christian State as such will have disappeared. It is to little, if any, purpose that we resist this tendency. In the present condition of the Christian Church it would not be wise, perhaps, to endeavor to retain the institution of the Christian State. But the secularization of the State cannot certainly be the culmination of Christian civilization. Nay, rather out of the monstrous character of such a position, thus made evident, will come the cry for a catholicity broad enough for the State to stand upon. After the failures of "independent morality," and Christless philosophies, and Godless civilizations, we may, perhaps, make real to ourselves that grand unity of which Plato dreamed in the Republic, or that still vaster and grander conception of St. Augustine in the "City of God."

The question of present practical relations with the various non-episcopal Churches around us is one of very great importance, and not to be too hastily concluded. It may serve to guide us in the consideration of the question if we keep distinctly in mind what the end is which we wish to have accomplished. This end I hold unhesitatingly

to be the restoration of organic unity. Whatever relations will tend to bring about this result upon the basis of the Catholic creeds and primitive order I believe to be precisely the relations most desirable for us to cultivate. Our view of the character of these relations may be somewhat modified if we consider them from a standing point which we are not much accustomed to occupy, and ask not what we have to contribute to this organic union, but what these other Christian bodies have to contribute. We are sufficiently familiar with the advantages and excellences of our own system. We value very highly the historical character and unbroken continuance of the ministry of the Church from Apostolic times. We attach great importance to the Church year, and liturgical worship. The dogmatic basis of the Church, in the universal creeds, and the Church system of training, we believe to be of inestimable value in the development of Christian character. The comprehensiveness and catholicity of the Church make it in its very nature the rallying ground for all the followers of Christ. Now let us see what special gifts and graces there are in the non-episcopal Churches, which they would be able to contribute to the Church of the future.

In the first place the numerical strength of these Christian bodies gives them very great importance and influence. For the most part great importance is attached among them to culture and learning among the clergy. We might naturally hesitate before entering into a comparison of our educational institutions with theirs. They have covered the land with benevolent organizations, and their missionary operations are to be found in every part of the heathen world. They witness also for the most part to those features of Christianity which are of the most vital importance. They have blessed and are blessing the world with innumerable saintly lives. It would not be difficult perhaps to enlarge upon the weak points in these religious systems, but that does not fall in with my present object,

which is to dwell upon those points in which their accession would enrich the Church of the future.

What we need very much to cultivate is a generous appreciation of these excellences to which I have referred. We shall do well to seek and value the personal relations to which such appreciation would naturally lead. There is also a large field of charitable and even religious effort in which association with Christians of other Churches would secure important results without any possible compromise of Church principles. The present Church law which forbids the participation, in any service, in our congregations, of any persons who have not been episcopally ordained, or are not communicants of our Church, may be wise in view of all the circumstances involved. Before there was such a law, liberty of action, in this matter, was a liberty to be vindicated if assailed. The law, however, as it now is, must be loyally obeyed. In the consideration of this subject, however, it should always be remembered that the relations between non-episcopal Churches and our own are not embarrassed as they are in England by the fact that the Church is an institution of the State.

Probably not much more can be done, at present, in the direction of organic unity than to make our own Church more and more truly evangelical and catholic, and to promote among ourselves a more intelligent and generous estimate of those Christians from whom, for the time, we are separated. It may not be long before the dangers which threaten our common Christianity will become so formidable as to force us into closer relations and union. What may be accomplished, in this respect, by a deeper sense than we now have of our underlying unity in Christ, we cannot now tell. May He who "maketh men to be of one mind in a house" bring this union to pass in His own good time.

In order that our Church may most wisely and efficiently aid in giving form to the future Church of the nation it is necessary that a reconciling ministry should be accomplished,

within its own borders, and among the various schools of opinion which it contains. We cannot expect that others will be drawn into unity with us until we have learned to be at unity among ourselves. We must start in our consideration of this part of our subject, with the fact clearly impressed upon our minds that, there has been an historical development of widely differing schools of opinion in the Church of England and the Churches with which it is in communion. At no time since the period of the Reformation has there been so wide a diversity in any one ecclesiastical organization. In those religious bodies even in which there is supposed to be the largest freedom from authority the limits of permissible belief are far more narrow than with us. This results from the fact that they avowedly exist for the purpose of exhibiting Christianity under some special type of it, and the presence in such societies of those to whom Christianity presents itself under another aspect is not desired. To my mind this comprehensiveness is a great glory of the Church, and the recognition and acceptance of it is the first step towards the unity for which, in the midst of diversity, we are to seek.

This diversity and comprehensiveness of the Church, in which the early schools of Rome and Alexandria are recalled to our minds, does not arise from any preconceived plan for the development of the Church, but is the inevitable result of the circumstances in which the Church has been placed. It was inevitable that the spirit of the Roman Empire, to so many of the forms and to so much of the genius of which the Church succeeded, should pass into the Christianity of modern times, and reveal itself in excess of dogma and organization. It was inevitable that the spirit of the Greek philosophy should characterize, in these latter days, a class of thinkers in the Church who would chafe under dogmatic authority, rebel against what they might regard as too rigid organization, and contend for freedom in subjecting both the Church and Revelation to

the test of human reason. It was inevitable that there should be a class of men who, starting with supreme regard for the spiritual in Christianity, should attribute to the Scriptures, in their understanding of them, an authority which they deny to the Church, and accept the traditions of their own school as more to be valued than those which have the sanction of Catholic consent. It is easy to see excellences in each of these schools. It is easy to see the perils to which the unrestrained development of any of them would lead. Let any one of them be separated from the restraining influences of the Church and it would soon run into the most dangerous extremes.

Even within the Church and under the restraining influence exercised by the presence of other classes of opinion, each of these schools has, at least in the case of some of its members, and with threatening indication of wider defection, gone beyond the limits of the legitimate comprehensiveness of the Church, and transgressed the boundaries of evangelical and catholic truth. There is a latent source of error in the exclusive position of each, and it flows with ever increasing volume through the logical processes by which the original position is developed. Each one, therefore, has in it an element of danger for the Church.

How shall they be restrained and these threatening dangers averted—is a question which has always been one of great importance; perhaps never of more importance than now. It is a vital question in connection with the subject we are considering.

The method which most naturally suggests itself, and which has been most frequently adopted, is that of repression by ecclesiastical authority. It is evidently within the legitimate province of the Church to protect itself from erroneous teaching. The only question, is by what means that protection can best be secured. Let it be by ecclesiastical authority, through pains and penalties, if that method, and that alone, can succeed. But when we remember that we are in the first place to be certain that the teaching which

we propose to repress is erroneous, and, in the second, that our attempts to suppress it by force, if it be erroneous, may not succeed, we may well pause before we proceed in that direction. History teaches us a very important lesson in this respect, especially the history which this generation has been making. The effort which has been made in England to restrain by legal proceedings the excesses of each of these schools in turn has been attended only with failure, and the present agitation under the Public Worship Regulation Act is most disastrous in its effect upon the Church. The attempts of the same sort which have been made in the Church in this country have been no more encouraging.

It would seem, therefore, that even if such proceedings are right in theory they are not practicable in the present state of public opinion. It is doubtful, however, whether they are even theoretically right, in connection with any opinions which, by a liberal construction, can be regarded as belonging to any one of these historical schools. It is not at all unlikely that the protection of the Church from false teaching may be found after all to depend largely upon the free development of these various schools. Each one is held back from excess by the restraining influence of the others. But if you suppress one, wholly or in part, you not only restrain the free development of the Church in that direction, but you give undue influence and power to opposing tendencies. Suffer all to work freely together, and each will prove a conservative power in the Church.

We may go further even than this. Where we have reason to believe there is loyalty to Christ and to our Church, a man so far from being restrained, is to be encouraged in the avowal of the opinions of any of these historical schools within the limits to which his loyalty will permit him to go. If he has no true loyalty to Christ or the Church, and is only making an hypocritical pretext of it, I know of no better protection for the Church than that which is to be found in the loss of influence and power

by which such hypocrisy is sure to be attended. The bold and frank avowal of convictions in regard to this whole class of subjects is of immense importance to a rich and full development of the Church. It is repressed convictions, and utterances to which there is no corresponding belief, that degrade individual character and are fatal to any robust faith in the Church.

This strong avowal of personal conviction, which I claim should be encouraged rather than repressed, is perfectly consistent with the toleration, so far as compulsory measures are concerned, of opposing convictions. They may be tolerated so far as compulsion is concerned, while they are properly assailed by force of argument. They may be tolerated, if for no other reason, than that they may in that way be the more readily restrained.

I plead for strong individual assertion of what seems to each man divine truth, and for generous toleration of similar assertion on the part of others. It is no compromise of what we believe to be truth that I advocate, but simply the according to others of what we feel to be so solemn a duty for ourselves. But there is a deeper reason still for this large and brotherly toleration. Our views of truth are very limited and partial, and while there are certain fundamental principles in regard to which we will not admit that there can be any reasonable doubt, we have reason to believe that there is a higher unity in which these apparently irreconcilable systems are found to enter harmoniously, each necessary to the completeness and symmetry of the whole.

When we have become familiar with one class of phenomena in the heavenly bodies and learned the facts and laws, for instance, of the solar system, we are disturbed by revelations of nebulae and binary stars. We should have expected simply the reproduction through space of what we have found so beautiful and admirable in our own system. But the *Maker* of the universe has a higher and

all-comprehending unity to which all these diversities are subordinated.

May it not be, after all, that the ultimate cause of all these diversities which now so greatly disturb us, and seem so inconsistent with unity, is to be found in the multitudinous aspects of the character and work of Christ? Here there has come to us a Divine Man, flooded with the glories of the infinite, the express image of God, and men gaze with dazzled vision at this marvellous revelation and then strive to utter what they have seen. No wonder that different aspects of the splendor have flashed upon different eyes; and since no man, nor all men, have witnessed and can testify to the whole glory of this revelation of God, no wonder that it is difficult now to blend all testimonies into one harmonious representation of what Christ is and what Christ has done. Let each man to whose longing gaze Christ has manifested himself, say freely, though he may say with sad imperfection, just what Christ, in that marvellous experience, seemed to him.

When it was the purpose of David to build a temple which should exceed all other structures, in stateliness and magnificence, he called upon the people to make their offerings for the erection of this House of the Lord. There were brought to the king, in vast abundance, silver, and gold, and brass, and iron, and cedar wood and hewn stones. When the building came to be erected, it rose, without noise of hammer, like "a majestic palm in the desert." We are called upon to bring our contributions to the building up of the great Church of the future, the visible organization of the redeeming work of Christ in our land. We are to bring to it the consecration of our lives, whatever of natural gifts of learning, or eloquence, or powers of administration, there may be among us. We are to bring to it the sacrifice of our prejudices, of our partisan spirit, of our unholy ambition. We are to bring to it glad and grateful recognition of all that others can bring. We are to bring to it great heritages from the past which God has entrusted

to our keeping, but more especially, all we have of present devotion and grace. We are to bring to it our faith in God and Christ, our hope for the future of the world, our charity for all mankind. This great temple of the time to come will be built without the touch of human hand, by the power of the Holy Ghost. It will rise amid the surrounding darkness like a vast dome of light, as when northern fires flash suddenly and silently in countless spires through the heavens. Though radiant as the luminous sky it shall be as firm and enduring as the everlasting rock. O grand and beautiful vision of prophecy, rise, in all thy glorious reality, upon the longing eyes of the children of God!

JOHN COTTON SMITH.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH AND THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD.

How is the world to be converted to God? The most important question which can possibly be presented to the mind of man! I propose to consider it in the light of history. At the first assembling of the disciples after the Ascension of our blessed Lord, the number of names together, was about one hundred and twenty. Not that there were no more Christians—but that was the number constituting the acting body of the Church. Then about three thousand souls were added on the Day of Pentecost, among whom were “devout men” of various nations, who must have carried to their respective countries the glad tidings of salvation. Soon after this, five thousand more were added, who were *men*, no mention being there made of women, excepting afterwards, that “multitudes believed both of men and women,” and that “the Lord added to the Church daily, such as should be saved,” so that within

one month after the Day of Pentecost, there were not less than fifteen thousand converts added to the Church. Then immediately after this, the whole body of the Church at Jerusalem was driven away by persecution, and "went everywhere, preaching the Word." St. Peter labored successfully in Pontus, Gallacia, Cappadocia, Asia Minor, Bithynia and even as far as Babylon. St. Paul passed from country to country, and the testimony of Demetrius the Ephesian silversmith, may be regarded as some proof of the success of his labors. "Moreover, ye see and hear that not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, so that not only this our craft is in danger of being set at nought, but also that the Temple of the great Goddess Diana should be despised." In relation to the other Apostles, we know but little, except that they "wrought many signs and wonders by the power of the Spirit of God;" that "many thousands believed;" and that flourishing Churches were established before the death of St. John, in all the principal cities of the then known world. In the year 110, A. D., Pliny, the Roman Governor wrote "that Christianity was not confined to cities only, but had spread through the villages and country and included great numbers of all ranks and ages, and of both sexes so that the Temples (heathen), were almost deserted." In the year 150, A. D., Justin Martyr wrote that "there is no race of men, whether Barbarians or Greeks, or by whatever name they may be designated, whether Scythians, Tartars or Arabians, amongst whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered to the Father and Creator of all in the name of the crucified Jesus." In the year 175, A. D., Irenæus wrote that "the Gospel prevailed among the Germans and Celts, Egyptians, Libyans and Orientals." A. D., 198, Tertullian declared "we are but of yesterday, and yet we have filled your empire, your cities, your islands, your towns, your assemblies, your very camps, your tribes, your companies, your palaces, your senate and your forum. We

constitute the majority in almost every town—the Parthians, Medes, Persians, the inhabitants of Mesopotamia, Armenia, Phrygia, Cappadocia, Pontus, Egypt and parts beyond Cyrene; all the extremities of Spain, many nations of the Gauls and places in Britain inaccessible to the Roman armies, have been subdued to Christ.”

With this general statement of the progress of the Church and the number of Christians before the year 200, A. D., I now pass on to the year 450, A. D., at which time a minute and reliable computation may be made of the number of Dioceses, of Bishops, of Clergy and the number of inhabitants, the facts of which have come down to our own time and are admitted by the best historians. The particulars of this computation would take up too much space, but the following is an outline. In the six Roman provinces of Africa, there were not less than five hundred Dioceses, covering over sixteen hundred and fifty miles each, averaging from sixty to eighty towns and villages and containing more than eighty millions of inhabitants professedly Christians. Then in the provinces of Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis, the most populous on the face of the globe, there were at least one hundred Dioceses, averaging more than one thousand miles each and containing not less than five millions of nominal Christians. Then in the Patriarchate of Jerusalem including Palestine and Arabia Petrea, there were forty-eight Dioceses and not less than five millions of Christians. Then in the Patriarchate of Antioch, including a large extent of country and a great number of cities as Tyre, Sidon, Damascus, Ptolemais, Palmyra and so forth, there were one hundred and sixty-four Dioceses, and giving at least thirty-three millions of Christians in this Patriarchate alone. Then in the Patriarchate of Constantinople there were six hundred Dioceses, small and large; four hundred in Asia, and two hundred in Europe. In one of these Asiatic Dioceses of which St. Basil was Bishop, there were three hundred and seventy Assistant Bishops, each having as many presbyters and deacons under him; and in this

whole Patriarchate there were not less than one hundred and twenty millions of Christians. Then in Italy, Spain, France and Ireland, there were five hundred and twenty-five Dioceses, averaging more than one hundred Parishes to a Diocese, and giving twenty-six millions of Christians. To these must be added a large number of Christians in Persia, in India, in Ethiopia, as also in Britain and the north of Europe. In Persia alone there were as many as fifty Dioceses. In A. D., 330, the Bishops of thirty-three of these Dioceses suffered martyrdom at the same time. In one Diocese alone, two hundred and fifty of the inferior clergy suffered with their Bishop. It cannot be an over estimate therefore if we allow one hundred Dioceses in all these countries with at least five millions of Christians.

Now if we bring together the result of these calculations, we shall have at least two hundred and seventy or two hundred and eighty millions of Christians in the year A.D., 450, in Dioceses, the names of which have been preserved to this day, and this is little, if any, short of the whole number of nominal Christians at the present time, on the face of the globe. In this estimate the fifth century is not taken as the period when the number of nominal Christians was greater than at any other time, but only as contrasted with the present. Possibly there may be some mistakes in the computation; though I have followed the very learned investigation which was made a few years ago by the late Rev. Dr. Chapin of New Haven, in his "*Primitive Church*," and who assured me in a private letter written only a short time before his death, that he had no reason to doubt the accuracy of his computation. But granting all that may be required for mistakes in the estimate, still the strange and startling fact is one that cannot be denied and which must be boldly looked in the face, that the number of nominal Christians at the present time on the face of the globe, is scarcely greater than it was in the fifth century of the Christian era.

No doubt there have been new accessions of physical, intel-

lectual and moral power, new and fresh demonstrations of the Divine origin and authority of the Christian Church. The Christian nations of the earth are more civilized, and enlightened, and more free; and the hidden leaven of God's Truth has been continually at work in renovating and ameliorating the condition of mankind. But in converting the heathen and the savage, in demolishing the idols of Pagan and Heathen Idolatry, in reaching the debased and ignorant masses of the world, and extending over numbers the influences of the Redeemer's Kingdom we have scarcely advanced at all.

Is not this a startling fact? And one before which the Christian world should tremble and turn pale with guilt and shame? Can it be possible? Can it be possible that since the glorious Reformation—a period of more than three hundred years, with all the unnumbered advantages which we have possessed; with the art of printing to aid in disseminating the Scriptures—with the vast machinery of means which have been brought into action by various societies, expressly to propagate the Gospel—and the modern invention of revivals—can it be possible that little or no actual progress has been made in converting the nations? Alas! the fact is most painful and humiliating; and yet as a fact, susceptible of the clearest demonstration, it ought to be rung in the ears of Christians, until all are convinced and are willing to acknowledge that *something* is fatally and radically wrong.

Here then is unfolded a question of infinite moment—what is that *something*? Where is that *wrong*? To answer these questions requires not the vision of a seer or the tongue of a prophet; for the seers and prophets have spoken. On this subject the Scriptures are as clear and plain as upon any other, and there can be no mistake as to their interpretation. We have only to look at our Saviour's prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane. "*Neither pray I for these alone,*" that is not alone for the Apostles and faithful few who have become My disciples, "*but for them*

also which shall believe on Me through *their word*," that is for all succeeding generations of Christians in all the ages of the world, "*that they all may be one.*" Not that they may agree to disagree, which would be treason to the truth, not simply that they may have some views and principles in common for the maintenance of which they may be willing to coalesce and contend; not that they may be united together as conspirators for the accomplishment of their evil purposes, but *that they may be one, really and truly one, as having One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism—that they may be one, even as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee, that they may be one in Us*, that is, that their unity as Christians may be as perfect as it can be, outwardly and inwardly, visibly and invisibly, as members of *One Body and partakers of One Spirit*.

And then comes the reason—the grand consideration—the all-important end and object of this *oneness*, "*that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.*"

Upon what then depends the conversion of the world? Plainly, not upon the influence of numbers, not upon secular authority and power, not upon worldly pomp and glory, not upon missionary meetings and missionary schools, not upon the talents, learning and eloquence of man, not upon zeal or energy or labor of sectarian pride or prejudice, but under God and in accordance with His will, upon the *Unity* of the Church.

I say not the union of the Church, for there may be union without unity; a mere coalition of discordant elements based upon the principles of temporary policy and expediency and destined to break out into the production of a thousand factions, but *unity, oneness*.

Can nothing be done to restore the lost unity of Christendom? Yes, much every way, and even by ourselves. We can ourselves be examples of that unity, and so let our light shine before men. We can "continue stedfast," as did the early disciples, "in the Apostolic doctrine and fellowship; in breaking of bread in the prayers." We can hold fast as they did "the form of sound words," and we

can "mark those who cause division" and at least avoid "their evil example." We can exercise the virtues of firmness, patience and fortitude, and we can have that "fervent charity among ourselves, which covers a multitude of sins." We can "pray for the whole state of Christ's Church militant," not merely for those who are called Evangelical and who do not constitute one-twentieth part of Christendom, but we can enlarge our petitions and our hearts for "all who profess and call themselves Christians," for the Greek and the Oriental, the Roman and the Protestant. We can remember with joy that the great majority of the Christian world are Episcopal, and notwithstanding the additions and corruptions of the Faith here and there, yet, God be praised! we have all the *same* prayers, the *same* sacraments, the *same* fasts and festivals, and the same Apostolic ministry. Therefore we can feel that having such common ground to stand upon, the barriers which separate us may be broken down; and the blessed and glorious *oneness* for which the Saviour prayed, and upon which depends the conversion of the world, may be restored; restored not as it was when kings and emperors began to call it theirs and adorn it with gold; but restored as it was in the days of its virgin purity, when suffering and reproach and chains were its only insignia; when the fire, the rack and the gibbet were its only preferments and rewards. God be praised, we can place our hope and trust in *Him*, and in answer to our prayers, "He can show wonders among the dead, and cause even the dead to rise up and praise Him," and therefore, though we weep as we remember Zion, and sigh to see her in the dust, yet even now we may encourage ourselves with the hope that the time is not far distant when we shall "see eye to eye," and the lost unity of Christendom be restored in the One Holy Catholic Church.

Grant it gracious God!
That were a triumph of redeeming love,
For which admiring angels should renew
Their Alleluias round the throne of God.

JAMES A. BOLLES.

THE WEAKNESS AND STRENGTH OF PREACHING.

The impression prevails that the pulpit of our day is not the power that it has been, and that it is doubtful if its prestige will ever be recovered. The Pulpit and the Press have been compared as though they were rivals, and the palm has been awarded to the latter. This seems to me to be a great mistake; there is fairly no rivalry in the case; the spheres of the two are different. Preaching is not mere authorship; and the press, while it may help, can never take the place of the pulpit.

Reading what a man has written out of his own head, or upon his own responsibility, is a different and lower thing from hearing what one says who faces us with a message from God, and this is preaching. The hearer of it goes through an exercise widely different from that in which he reads what is written. It calls into play in him other and keener susceptibilities, and the effects differ accordingly. Over and above this difference, preaching is a Divine ordinance, and like every other, it can have no rival and no substitute in the field assigned to it. We are not indeed to believe that God ties Himself to this ordinance, or to any other, in such a way as to refuse its virtue to other instrumentalities. All visible means whatsoever, may be dispensed with by Him at His pleasure. A field of exception is to be recognized, in which we can only say that God works in ways known to Himself.

There is a weakness of the Pulpit, as there is the power of it. And the design of this paper is to point out some of the elements of that power; the absence or loss of

which, out of preaching, deprives it of its virtue and furnishes ground for the charge of "imbecility" that has been brought against it.

It will, I trust, be seen that it is not to preaching, so much as to the sort of it that goes on, that the weakness is attributable. There is preaching, so called, that is *not* preaching, and the word does not belong to it.

In the first place, a preacher is one who speaks with authority; not that an express divine commission is here alluded to, however important that may be thought; but such authority is meant as a man will use who is sure of his premises. He will not allow them to be disputed, however timid or uncertain he may be with respect to his own reasonings and deductions. The preacher must believe for himself, and he must ask the assent of his hearers, to the teaching of Holy Scripture, as the Truth. He must have his own decided grasp upon it, as ultimate and infallible—the only open question being as to the meaning of the Scriptures. He need not embrace any of the various theories of inspiration. It is enough that he takes his authoritative stand where he finds a "*thus saith the Lord*," and that too, with all the reverence of speech and manner that becomes such a stand. There must be no flippancy; matter and manner must correspond, otherwise the sermon will be worth no more than its logic is worth to them that hear it, and even that may be lost through irreverence or levity of manner. Its positions will be disputed, the Pulpit will be lowered, and the whole process will fall into disesteem and consequent powerlessness. Such a preacher will be forever put on the defensive. This turns the Pulpit into a platform whoever may be in it, and the preacher sinks to the level of a disputer of this world. Let him lower, in his own eyes or those of his hearers, the Holy Scriptures a single inch from the reverential regard that is due to them, or let him go outside of them for the ground of his teaching, or in any way abdicate his position as a messenger of God to man, and a host of specialists will come in

through the door he leaves open for them. And he will find himself in an arena, where he must take his chance with all the men and women who have *missions* in this world no higher than he has tacitly confessed his own to be. The preacher who drops the positive truths of his religion in dealing with disbelievers or disputers of them, in order to take up their own weapons, whatever else he does, ceases to preach. He becomes a man of science among scientists, or a politician among politicians, or he discourses of something about which his hearers are presumed to know as much as he does, and commonly they know a great deal more. That is lecturing, or it is haranguing, or it is disputing, not preaching.

Another element of strength in the Pulpit is doctrinal preaching. A distinction has been wrongly taken between doctrinal and practical preaching. Doctrine should never have been preached in a way to allow of such a distinction. It has been presented as a mere skeleton, upon which the hearer might hang such clothing as pleased him, or leave it unclothed. It has not been brought to bear closely enough upon life and character to demonstrate its virtue. And so the cry has been to let dogma go, and to preach the living Christ. The first part of this demand has been yielded to largely. Accommodating preachers have left out of their sermons the frame work of the Christian religion, and given forth from the Pulpit a series of moral truths, divested of the motives and sanctions of Christianity. They have preached sentiment, which, having no adequate support for it put forward, has turned, in the hearer's mind, to mere sentimentality. Or, they give forth warnings and exhortations, which fall to the ground, for the want of any solemn truth or stubborn fact underlying them, either in the word of God or the conscience of man. And so the practical preaching that ignores doctrine deliquesces and is "like water that runneth apace." True it is, that the right sort of preaching is the living Christ. But, as has been said by some one, this demand requires that Christ should at least

be preached, that *He lives*—and that is doctrine. The true stand is this—to preach doctrine, not as a mere system or framework of the faith, and never as a bare or scantily clothed skeleton. A skeleton, however, is necessary to a living, walking human being, if you will have him live and walk. And so the preacher must have that in the sermon he preaches. But he will never leave his skeleton in his hearers' hands, to be possibly clothed with flesh and blood, or to be left by him a mere heap of dry bones. The true preacher will clothe the skeleton himself; he will give it form and comeliness; he will warm it into flesh and blood before his hearers' eyes, and he will not let go of it till the Christ that is in it lives and breathes with the power that He is. Because doctrinal preaching stops short of this, it is dry uninfluential preaching. And because there are preachers that do nothing but try to make flesh and blood of their sermons, without a corresponding framework, there is literally no back bone to them and they collapse. The zeal that is in them is out of all proportion to any seeming occasion for it, and they last no longer than the sound of them lasts in the ears; the residuum is a heap of words; that is all that is carried away of such preaching, however pleasant the sound thereof, if anything is carried away. There are, therefore, two kinds of doctrinal preaching; one of which is practical preaching, in the essence and the worth of it, and the other is not preaching at all; it is syllogizing, or summing up, or some dry uninfluential mode of treatment that belongs in the preacher's study, not in his Pulpit. As, in the preacher himself, it is the living personal man, with the glow on his face of life and feeling, that moves, so, in his sermons, it is clothing the doctrinal outlines that he holds in his hands with the flesh and blood of actual life, that makes the preaching strong with something more than mere emotion. This is the only sort of preaching that will stir men to their feet with a power that will keep them moving when the sermon is done. It is admitted that some of the preachers most sought after,

preach a sort of religion that seems to have no creed and no dogmatic truth in it. But then we have yet to learn whether those sermons will outlast themselves, or even survive their delivery, save as specimens of touching sentiment, or mere oratory.

On the other hand, the London preacher, Mr. Spurgeon, owes his sustained popularity, to the preaching of a few strong doctrines, strongly held and boldly put forward. And the same may be said of Mr. Moody. So that doctrinal preaching need not be eschewed because it must needs be unwelcome preaching. There is no doubt that doctrine was preached fifty years ago among us more clearly and sharply than it is now. It is because so many of the preachers of that day failed to clothe properly their skeletons, that we encounter now a traditionary prejudice against doctrinal preaching. The evil, however, has not stopped here. Doctrine has been so extensively ignored or cautiously put forward in the Pulpit, in obedience to this prejudice, that the pews are getting unused to it and grow restive under it. We are hearing from them the cry for toleration more and more loudly. The Pulpit yields, it echoes the demand; *toleration* is the watchword of the day. One distinguished preacher has "toleration to a large extent." And though he may have in his mind varying modes of worship, rather than varying doctrines, the apprehension is not ill grounded that the Christianity that is coming, will turn a cold eye upon all definiteness that is likely to offend.

That the drift is that way cannot be denied. There are signs of sympathy between the adherents of opposite extremes in this Church, both in doctrine and ritual, for no purpose that has come to light, other than that of tolerating, excusing or forgiving one another. We seem to be approaching an era of universal handshaking and cordiality. He who shall prefer a charge of heresy against either extreme, will have to encounter the opposition of both. Each holding his own opposing and irreconcilable views

against the other, but aware that he needs "toleration to a large extent." This portends, within the Church a new Evangelical Alliance, and that is a tacit agreement each to hold his peace in the presence of the other. That sort of peace has been hitherto regarded in this Church as a pleasant delusion. But it is to be feared, as a sign of the relaxing hold on doctrinal truth by preachers of the gospel; and there is a worse than a mere fear of its effects upon the pews. There it is the trumpet giving "an uncertain sound." And what that means, St. Paul has told us.

Another element of strength in the Pulpit may be called preaching the gospel in its fullness, that it may make itself so felt in our social life as to be obeyed there; and that is the proof of strong preaching. Neither the morality of the gospel, nor the solemn motives and sanctions it discloses, can be safely left out of the Pulpit, nor can they be, without danger, lowered or altered from the position they occupy in the New Testament. The Pulpit has been teeming with discourses upon "the sins of the times." And yet, to one who reads such of them as get into print, they seem largely lacking in the true gospel persuasion to virtue and its dissuasions from vice; or, these are altered in some way out of the constraint that belongs to them. "The gospel of love" seems to be on the lips of preachers who forever fail to anchor the love they preach where God has anchored it, namely: in the cross of Christ. God has fixed there His estimate of the guilt of sin and crime. That measure of the love of God, and that measure of human guilt, it is laid on every preacher of the gospel to proclaim, even to the extent of a woe upon him if he preach it not.

I will illustrate what I mean by a lack of preaching the fullness of the gospel in a single direction. It is in that which St. Paul calls "the terror of the Lord." In the history of a certain style of preaching on this subject we have got to the point where the question is raised of the *duration* of the future punishment. That question, it is humbly submitted, should be left by preachers of the

gospel, where He left it whose ministers we are. If we are true to our commission we will stop with our preaching where He stopped, nor endeavor to be more loving or merciful than he who was Love's Incarnation. I know it is said that it is a gospel of love rather than one of terror and of fear, and so it is. It is said, moreover, that the fear of hell is an unworthy motive of such a gospel. But is it an unworthy motive? Was it love, or what was it that declared "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The only question is, was it a *fact*? If so, then it was the very faithfulness of love that proclaimed it. The enemy of mankind set himself to work that assurance out of the human mind, because of the power that was in it. He succeeded, and the woman fell. Is that the way that the hearers of sermons are falling now, the forgers, the defaulters, the adulterers, who believe in a gospel of love, out of which all fear is gone or reduced to its minimum? In alarming numbers these people have been sinning within the pale of the Church.

To the question, can that be virtue, and can that be religion, which constrains through the fear of hell? It is replied without hesitation—Yes—anything that deters from sin and excites to duty, if it be a truth of God, is virtue and it is religion. I do not say it is the highest or the worthiest. But *moral discipline* is what the Christianity of the day needs more than it needs anything else. Of religious sentiment it is full, even to the sickening of men of thought and of sceptical turn of mind. And this discipline it must be led to, through an outspoken and sinewy Pulpit. "It is acquired mainly," as a late writer puts it, "by the practice of doing what one does not like, under the influence of a mastering fear or hope." Both these mastering influences are in the gospel as it stands in the New Testament. And when they are preached from that Book simply and fully in the way in which they stand there, by preachers who have the fear of God and no fear of man before their eyes, then the foolishness of preaching becomes the power of God unto salvation.

One additional element of strength in preaching will be named, and scarcely more than named; and yet it is the most indispensable of all. I mean a profound sense in the preacher himself of the real wants of the souls committed to his care. The preacher may have all the needful gifts for his office. He may be a born preacher, so that those gifts may be easily available in his hands. His preaching may have all the dignity which belongs to it as an authoritative message from God to man. It may have the happy combination of dogma and practice, doctrine and life here claimed for it; and it may present the truth of God in all its depth and on both its sides. It may be bold and uncompromising, having the fear of God and no fear of man about it. There the preacher may stand to all human appearance, a thoroughly furnished ambassador. He may stand there fully up to the wants of his time, knowing all the ins and outs of the human nature with which he has to deal, and equal to grappling successfully with all the questions that come out of the busy brains and longing hearts before him. And yet, and over and above all this, if he do not stand there having grasped in some adequate measure and so as to make it his controlling thought, the amazing capacity of the souls before him for happiness and misery, both in this world and that which is to come, he will fail, and that wretchedly, in his chosen vocation of a preacher of the gospel.

Under all the gifts, and strength, all the equipments of the preacher, *the man* must appear, and he must speak out of the humanity that is in him—itself a living experience of the instincts and the aspirations, the joys and the sufferings, the hopes and the fears of the average human being; such a preacher will look into the faces before him and recognize his kindred. He will know them by the token vouchsafed to him by faith, of his own completeness in *Christ alone*. Then the preacher will preach strongly, for then it is not he, but Christ that liveth in him who speaks.

A. SCHUYLER.

CHURCH PRINCIPLES IN CHURCH HISTORY.

ST. CYPRIAN.

It is by no means easy to form an accurate estimate of our obligations to the representative men of the early Christian Church. On the one hand we often fail to honor them for what they really were; and, on the other, we are inclined to glorify them for what they were not. Because they differ very widely from ourselves, or because their indispensable testimony is sometimes as inconvenient as it is necessary, we almost forget their simple piety, their utter self-sacrifice for truth and God. Or, because they belong to the earliest Christian centuries, because they are our primary witnesses both of the Canon of New Testament Scripture and of the Apostolic Church order, because they are martyrs and saints, we invest them with an almost superhuman dignity; we regard their private opinions and even their passing allusions, nay, sometimes their bare silence, as authoritative and infallible.

And it is necessary that we should be on our guard against these contrary dangers when we try to estimate correctly our obligations to such a man as S. CYPRIAN. He was by no means without faults—though assuredly it would be hard to find the man, and especially among God's priests, free enough from sin "to cast the first stone at him." His life was embittered by controversy and opposition; and he sometimes treats his opponents with an almost savage hardness, which the good manners of modern society, to say nothing of Christian charity, would condemn. But

then he is not to be judged by the good manners of modern society; while even Christian charity is not required to "rejoice in iniquity," or to condone disloyalty to goodness and truth. Compared with the acrid invectives of the fiery Tertullian, whom he was wont to call his master, his harshest censures seemed scarcely more stern than the inevitably earnest reproof of Christian sincerity. And we must remember that toleration is the child of political freedom, and—shall I say religious indifference? A man's liberty to blaspheme Almighty God, to deny Christ, to neglect the sacraments, to dismember the Church, was *not* very highly prized by Christian doctors in the third century. It seemed to them no better than the liberty to go to hell, and the yet more terrible liberty of dragging other people to perdition along with them. Cyprian believed that no man could be saved excepting on God's own conditions; he had no doubt whatever as to the nature of those conditions; and he could be a party to no compromise which seemed to him to sacrifice the essentials of salvation. It is very easy for people to be charitable who believe that every man has a right to construct his own theology and his own Church; and that one Church or creed is as good, or at least, as sufficient as any other.

We may detect in Cyprian, no doubt, some taint of that peculiar haughtiness which is the besetting danger of every one who believes that he has a special vocation from God, together with the authority and the power, without which, it would be impossible for him to respond effectively to the Divine call. We, ourselves, do not live in an age of strong religious convictions. We boast not of the supremacy of law, nor even of the supremacy of God, but of the supremacy of conscience—and one conscience is as good as another. In things spiritual we mistake *the eye* for *the visible universe*; therefore we have no objective standard, which being true for one is true for all. There are many contradictions of what we believe to be Christian truth, but we hesitate to call them heresies; there are innumerable sepa-

rations from what we believe to be the Church of Christ, but we hesitate to call them schisms. Our ministers, are priests, and our chief pastors are bishops, but there are only too many who repudiate sacerdotalism and apologize for episcopacy. Many even of those who hold office in the Church, seem chiefly anxious to assert, not *what they are*, but rather *what they are not*. Unquestionably, Cyprian would have regarded this "spirit of the age," as sheer Antichrist. A priest and bishop who had really no vocation and no authority, might, quite easily, have escaped the edge of the sword. It was quite another sort of men that turned the world upside down. There must, at any rate, have been something great and strong in this Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, or how could it have happened that people, even in this new world, after some sixteen hundred years, should care either to hear or speak about him?

He was a man of rare devotion to God and to His Church; magnifying not himself but his office. Prodigal in his generosity; ready, literally, to sell all that he had and give to the poor; dauntless in courage; unfaltering in faith and hope; realizing everywhere and always the presence of Christ; every inch a priest; every inch a bishop; counting not his life dear unto himself, so that he might finish his course with joy and the ministry that he had received of the Lord Jesus; slain with the sword; of whom the world was not worthy. Such a man was Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage.

And yet we are not required or permitted, to accept even him as a sufficient or infallible guide on all points of doctrine and discipline. He lived before, and apart from, some of those principal controversies by means of which the theology of the Church was developed and formulated. We look to his writings in vain, for those distinctions which were established at the Council of Nicæa, or elaborated by the logic of S. Augustine. Moreover, as we shall see, he was to the full as Latin in his practical tendency and bent of mind as the Romans themselves; and was wholly incap-

able of the refinement of Greek speculation. Though—as indeed it is superfluous to remark—he is unquestionably orthodox; and though his letters and treatises are full of most precious truth, there are, nevertheless, very few of the cardinal doctrines of Christianity to which, *in their present and technical form*, he can be cited as an unambiguous witness. While, if his doctrinal development and explicitness may seem to us defective, his ecclesiastical system, on the other hand, will seem to many, altogether too rigid and external. It contains the germs from which almost every mediæval extravagance has been developed. Assuredly, we must never forget his own words that “The martyrs do not make the Gospel.”

He had a very short public life, and the materials for his Biography are scanty. We have a short account of “the Life and Passion of Cyprian, Bishop and Martyr, by Pontius the Deacon,” which is little more than an inflated eulogy—but which is authentic and contemporary testimony, so far as it goes. There are also still extant some eighty of Cyprian’s letters, and a few of his treatises with fragmentary notices in Eusebius and elsewhere. We know, indeed, very little of *the man*—his inner life, his kindred, his mental and spiritual growth, his friendships; he stands before us as the ecclesiastic, the champion of episcopacy, of disciplinary rigour, of the unity of the Church, of the necessity of an Apostolic Ministry, and of the Sacraments. Nay, his deacon Pontius regards with a contemptuous indifference that larger part of his life which, though passed in a not unvirtuous heathenism, must have been the chief preparation for his future work; and not unvisited, we may be sure, by some rays of that “true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.”

“At what point shall I begin?” says Pontius, “from what direction shall I approach the description of his goodness, except from the beginning of his faith and from his heavenly birth? Inasmuch as the doings of a man of God should not be reckoned from any point except from

the time that he was born of God." Accordingly, we know next to nothing of Cyprian before his baptism. Baptism was to him, in veriest fact, a death, a burial, a resurrection, a new birth, a new creation. Indeed, it is from this side of personal experience that we can best understand his baptismal theory, and that still prevalent and orthodox doctrine of baptismal regeneration which is, perhaps, the oldest and the least changed of all the doctrines of the Church. Nothing can be plainer than Cyprian's teaching as to the effects and the necessity of baptism. Thus, for instance, he says that "the saving grace of baptism and of our Redeemer has delivered us from death." Again, "in baptism remission of sins is granted, once for all." And again, referring to those who had received what he regarded as a spurious baptism among heretics and schismatics, and who were therefore in his opinion—which was not, however, confirmed by later authoritative decision of the Church—not baptized at all, he says: "In order that, according to the Divine arrangement and the truth of the gospel, they may be able to obtain remission of sins and to be sanctified, and to become temples of God, it is absolutely necessary that all those who come to the Church of Christ from adversaries and antichrists, should be baptized with the baptism of the Church." Nay, so absolutely necessary to salvation was this sacrament, in the judgment of Cyprian—excepting in the case of those Catechumens who suffered martyrdom before they could be baptized, and thus received the baptism of blood, that he seems *almost* afraid to diminish the mere quantity of water in the accustomed ceremonial lest the contagion of sin should not be wholly washed away. Thus he speaks, not doubtfully, but hesitatingly, of the baptism of sick persons by sprinkling instead of immersion; justifying this condescension to human necessity with an odd mixture of common sense, and Christian wisdom, and irrelevant quotations from the Old Testament, after his manner. Magnus had asked him whether such persons were to be accounted really Chris-

tians, inasmuch as they had not been "washed," but only sprinkled with the saving water. He answers that they have, nevertheless, received the whole benefit of the sacrament; but, he says, "in this matter my diffidence and modesty prejudice no one so as to hinder any one from feeling as he thinks (right) and from acting as he feels."

Now Cyprian regarded baptism, like everything else, almost exclusively from the practical side—it was a part of "the law of Christ," and this gives a kind of sharpness to his doctrine, which makes it seem more extreme or exclusive than it is. Of course, however misty our mere theories may be, when we have to tell a man "what he must *do* to be saved," we find it necessary to be precise. And Cyprian told men, with the most emphatic unreserve, that what they had to do was to "repent and be baptized, every one of them, for the remission of sins." And we must not forget that this was, and is, the *Catholic* doctrine and the *Catholic* rule. It is at this moment, the undoubted and unhesitating belief of the enormous majority of Christians all over the world. It was the unanimous teaching of the Fathers, and one might almost add, of all heretics. It was regarded as one of "the first principles of the gospel of Christ."

Cyprian believed that mankind is redeemed by the incarnation, obedience, sacrifice, merits, power, presence, spirit of Christ. This he accepts as an ultimate fact. He does not attempt to explain it. He elaborates no theory of the Atonement, no scheme of satisfaction, no "philosophy of the plan of salvation." He even confounds, that is to say, he mixes up together, in the most incautious way, the grace of God and the merits of men. Or, to speak more accurately, he lived, and worked, and wrote at a time when the need had not arisen for extreme precision of dogmatic statements. But there can be no doubt whatever, that he believed that we are saved by the grace of God in Jesus Christ; and that, as the effective cause of our salvation, we are saved by this alone. Moreover, he clearly distin-

guished in baptism itself, the material from the spiritual. "Water alone," he says, "is not able to cleanse away sins, and to make a man holy, unless he have also the Holy Ghost." But he believed that Jesus Christ had attached to the gift of eternal life, to the promise of the Holy Ghost, a certain outward condition. "Except a man be born *of water* and of the Spirit," the Lord Himself had said, "he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The gospel was offered on these terms to all mankind; and when an adult, man or woman, refused or omitted to be baptized, Cyprian believed, and every one of the early fathers believed, that he deliberately refused or wholly neglected his own salvation. Whether this be true or not in American cities in the middle of the nineteenth century, it was most certainly true in Carthage in the middle of the third.

We cannot thoroughly sympathize with Cyprian's earnest advocacy of the necessity of baptism and the unity of the Church, we cannot even understand it, unless we try to realize what the Church was, and what the heathen world was, in the middle of the third century. No such contrast exists within our present experience. In ordinary life in a great modern city, say on the exchange, in commerce, in the law courts, in society—the Church and the world are undistinguishable. From his ordinary behaviour you cannot tell whether your neighbor is a Christian or not. Or, perhaps it would be more correct to say that amongst us, all life is thus far Christianized; and that the worst of the people about us are not average heathens, but bad Christians. But life and death, heaven and hell, are not more strongly contrasted than the Church and the world in the time of Cyprian.

"He was converted," deacon Pontius tells us, "from his worldly errors to the acknowledgement of the true divinity," by a very worthy presbyter named Cæcilius. Very shortly after this (A. D. 246) he wrote a long letter, sometimes included among his treatises, to Donatus, in which he describes the wonderful change which had taken place in

his own character, "by the help of the water of new birth" and "by the agency of the spirit breathed from heaven," and in which he also sets before Donatus, in vivid pictures, the startling contrast between the worldly and the Christian life. We obtain a similar insight into the ordinary feelings and usages of that age, from the treatise "on the dress of virgins," "on the lapsed," "on the public shows," "on the vanity of idols," "on the mortality," (a horrible plague that devastated Carthage), and from continual allusions scattered through his letters.

It is scarcely too much to say that idolatry in the great cities of the Roman empire had wholly lost its hold upon the intellects of men, and had become a stupid and debasing superstition. The Polytheism that still commended itself as a picturesque symbolism, to a few earnest and reverent spirits, was not the polytheism of the vulgar. The invincible arms of Rome had conquered, not only the liberties but the gods of almost the whole world. Truth and religion had been fatally divorced; and in the very noblest region of human life there was, for the few, contemptuous unbelief, for the many, a cruel and debasing fanaticism. The Christian apologists derided the gods as utterly powerless, not only to benefit their worshippers but even to save themselves. To a man like Cyprian, idolatry was a grovelling stupidity, until, indeed, he began to find in it a ghastly and inhuman devilry. We must remember that in the third century, what we understand by the Physical Sciences, had not come into existence. There was no clear and broad distinction in men's minds between the natural and the supernatural. Nature, as a uniform experience, determined by laws which for all practical uses of life must be considered unalterable, was wholly unknown. The gods of the old mythology had become discredited; but the same longings, the same fears, the same ignorance, the same deep need of a religion, which had produced them in the beginning were as real and potent as ever. But the head of humanity was no longer young and

joyous; men were crushed by tyranny, defiled by unnatural lusts, internally conscious of their pollution. Hope had died out of their lives. Even all nature seemed to reflect their own wretchedness and their own decay. Thus Cyprian appeals, in his "Address to Demetrianus," to a common belief, which being founded on what was considered a notorious and universal experience, needed no proof from the Sacred Scriptures. "The world," he says, "has now grown old. . . . In the winter there is not such an abundance of showers for nourishing the seeds; in the summer the sun has not so much heat for cherishing the harvest; nor in the spring season are the corn fields so joyous; nor are the autumnal seasons so fruitful in their leafy products. The layers of marble are dug out in less quantity from the disemboweled and wearied mountains; the husbandman is failing in the fields, the sailor at sea, the soldier in the camp, innocence in the markets, justice in the tribunal, concord in friendships, skilfulness in the arts, discipline in morals. We see grey hairs in boys—the hair falls before it begins to grow, and life. begins with old age. whatever is now born degenerates with the old age of the world itself." Hence, in this dreary misery, pagan religion took the form of frenzied orgies, or initiation into terrific and unutterable mysteries; while to the eye of the Christian, the whole world and even the bodies of men, and women, and children, were swarming with devils. Thus Cyprian says in his treatise "On the Vanity of Idols." "Impure and wandering spirits are lurking under the statues and consecrated images; these inspire the breasts of their prophets with their afflatus, animate the fibres of the entrails, direct the flights of birds, rule the lots, give efficiency to oracles, are always mixing up falsehood with truth, for they are both deceived and they deceive; they disturb the life (of those deceived by them), they disquiet their slumbers; these spirits also creeping into their bodies secretly, terrify their minds, distort their limbs, break their health, excite

diseases to force them to the worship of themselves, so that when glutted with the steam of the altars and the piles of cattle, they may unloose what they themselves had bound, and so appear to have effected a cure..... These, however, when adjured by us through the true God, at once yield and confess, and are constrained to go out from the bodies possessed. You may see them at our voice, and by the operation of the hidden majesty, smitten with stripes, burnt with fire, racked with the increase of a growing punishment, howling, groaning, entreating, confessing whence they came, and when they depart, even in the hearing of those very persons who worship them, and either springing forth at once or vanishing gradually, even as the faith of the sufferer comes in aid or the grace of the healer effects."

While, then, to men of keen intellect, the pagan religion was sheer stupidity, to men of fearful conscience, it became a ghastly deviltry. And on all sides it was the fruitful parent of that revolting immorality which renders a full description of heathen society utterly impossible. And here, as everywhere and always, "the dark places of the earth were full of the habitations of cruelty." When we read of the holy martyrs cast to the wild beasts, we think chiefly of the sufferings of the victims; very far more awful was the degradation of the spectators. We regard with very righteous disgust, those public entertainments which involve to the performers, extreme danger of life or limb, even when the danger is freely and gladly incurred. We have a society and laws for the prevention of cruelty to animals. But the fights of gladiators and the destruction of human beings by wild beasts, was the *amusement* of polite society and of the populace in the heathen Roman Empire. We need not wonder that in this intoxication of brutality, the tender affections of home and neighborhood were almost annihilated. In the pestilence which desolated Carthage, the heathen, through fear of infection, abandoned their own nearest kindred, and left the bodies of their dead

unburied in the streets. It was the Christians who tended the heathen sick, and who buried the heathen dead. In the earthliness and animalism of paganism, there was no quickening spirit, no hope of immortality. "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

To this stupidity, deviltry, lust, cruelty, despair, came the good news of the grace of God. "Therefore," said St. Paul, "we both labor and suffer reproach, because we have believed in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe." The Christian preachers told the world of a free and immediate forgiveness. They promised, in God's name, a Holy Spirit, who should purify and strengthen and comfort the spirits of men, and give them a real righteousness; delivering them out of darkness and bringing them into the marvellous light of truth and holiness. They preached love, not by words but by deeds. They proclaimed Christ and the resurrection and eternal life; and they called men into a sacred brotherhood, founded upon sacrifice, where law itself was liberty and where liberty was love.

This, then, was the contrast; here was the old man and the new, Christ and Antichrist, the devil and God, the festering corrupt world and the divine family, the Church coming down from heaven as a bride adorned for her husband. And the passage from one state to the other *was Baptism*. St. Cyprian believed that there was no other; and for my own part, I entirely believe that he was right. Christianity was not a doctrine to be learned in a school, and enjoyed as a luxury of the choice spirits of the age. It was a life, a battle, a brotherhood, a kingdom of heaven. Emphatically at the beginning of the great conflict were the words of our Saviour true, "he that is not with me is against me." A secret Christianity, a birth of the spirit that was afraid or ashamed of the baptism of water, a safely obscure piety, "passing on the other side," while St. Felicitas and St. Perpetua were torn to pieces by wild beasts for the love of Jesus—this was too infamously con-

temptible. "Whosoever," says the Master, "shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in heaven; and whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father who is in heaven." "He that taketh not his cross and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it."

And while holy baptism was regarded as *the only way* to the new and divine life—the adoption into the family of God—it was regarded as *a real and genuine way*. Therein the old man was verily dead and buried with Christ. The newly baptized received the full and free forgiveness of his sins. The Holy Ghost was given to him, as his ever present monitor and guide. He was welcomed into a genuine brotherhood. He became in very fact, "a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven." Nor was the grace of baptism any the less real because it was the expression of the eternal love of God; or because like all other gifts of God it was changed into a curse by hypocrisy or lost by sin.

And in the time of Cyprian, the manner of baptism corresponded, far more nearly than now, with its supreme importance. It was administered almost always by the Bishop, to candidates, who, if adults, had been long and carefully prepared. Or, if administered by some other, it was followed immediately by Episcopal confirmation. It was rendered more impressive by immersion three times, by symbolic anointing with consecrated oil, by signing with the sign of the cross, by the laying on of hands, by the administration of the Eucharist. It was a crisis in a man's life, and an event never to be forgotten. Then he "put on Christ;" then his desires, his prayers, his good resolutions, his spiritual earnestness, because a real and complete discipleship.

Here I may remark, for even this has been denied, that the practice of infant baptism was so universal, and its lawfulness and benefits so undisputed in the Church and Province over which St. Cyprian presided, that it seems impos-

sible to doubt that both the practice and the doctrine rested upon a genuine Apostolic tradition, to say nothing of the record of the New Testament itself. Apart from any direct Apostolic authority, the baptism of infants would have been a most true development; for the relation of children to the divine family and to the Kingdom of Heaven, must have clamoured for a settlement from the very foundation of the Church. But neither the temper of the first half of the third century in general, nor of the African Church and its illustrious doctors in particular, would have been satisfied with a merely theoretical justification of any practice which might have seemed like an innovation in a mystery so sacred as the Sacrament of Regeneration. St. Cyprian, like Tertullian before him, demanded not argument but prescription.

On this matter of infant baptism, however, we have not only the judgment of St. Cyprian himself, which alone would be conclusive as to the usage of his Church, but he writes on this subject to Fidus, in the name also of his Episcopal colleagues, sixty-six in number, assembled in Council. "In respect of the case of infants," he says, "which you say ought not to be baptized within the second or third day after their birth, and that the law of ancient circumcision should be regarded, so that you think that one who is just born should not be baptized and sanctified within the eighth day, we all thought very differently in our Council. For in this course which you thought was to be taken, no one agreed; but we all rather judge that the mercy and grace of God is not to be refused to any one born of man. For as the Lord says in His gospel: 'The Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them,' as far as we can, we must strive that, if possible, no soul be lost..... With respect to what you say, that the aspect of an infant in the first days after its birth is not pure, so that any one of us would still shudder at kissing it, we do not think that this ought to be alleged as any impediment to heavenly grace. For it is written, 'to the

pure all things are pure.' Nor ought any of us to shudder at that which God hath condescended to make. For although the infant is still fresh from its birth, yet it is not such that any one should shudder at kissing it in giving grace and in making peace; since in the kiss of an infant every one of us ought, for his very religion's sake, to consider the still recent hands of God themselves, which in some sort we are kissing, in the man lately formed and freshly born, when we are embracing that which God has made. In respect of the observance of the eighth day in the Jewish circumcision of the flesh..... we think that no one is to be hindered from obtaining grace by that law which was already ordained, and that spiritual circumcision ought not to be hindered by carnal circumcision, but that absolutely every man is to be admitted to the grace of Christ, since Peter also in the Acts of the Apostles speaks, and says: 'The Lord hath said to me that I should call no man common or unclean.' But if anything could hinder men from obtaining grace, their more heinous sins might rather hinder those who are mature and grown up and older. But, again, if even to the greatest sinners, and to those who had sinned much against God, when they subsequently believed, remission of sins is granted, and nobody is hindered from baptism and from grace; how much rather ought we to shrink from hindering an infant, who, being lately born, has not sinned, except in that, being born after the flesh according to Adam, he has contracted the contagion of the ancient death at its earliest birth, who approaches the more easily on this very account to the reception of the forgiveness of sins, that to him are remitted, not his own sins, but the sins of another.

"And, therefore, dearest brother, this was our opinion in Council, that by us no one ought to be hindered from baptism and from the grace of God, who is merciful and kind and loving to all. Which, since it is to be observed and maintained in respect of all, we think is to be even more observed in respect of infants and newly-born persons, who

on this very account, deserve more from our help and from the Divine mercy, that immediately, on the very beginning of their birth, lamenting and weeping, they do nothing else but entreat."

The same practical earnestness which led Cyprian to perceive so clearly and affirm so unhesitatingly the absolute necessity of baptism, led him to contend with equally uncompromising zeal for the *unity of the Church*. His language on this subject is perfectly clear and vigorously emphatic. He affirms the *unity of the Church* over and over again, in many forms, by many figures, with much quotation more or less relevant from the Holy Scriptures, both of the Old Testament and the New. And in addition to multiplied allusions and assertions elsewhere, he has written a treatise on this subject with special reference to the schism of Novatian. "The spouse of Christ," he says, in the treatise, "cannot be adulterous; she is uncorrupted and pure. She knows one home; she guards with chaste modesty the sanctity of one couch; she keeps us for God; she duly orders the sons whom she has born for the kingdom. Whoever is separated from the Church and joined to an adulteress, is separated from the promises of the Church; nor can he who forsakes the Church of Christ attain to the rewards of Christ. He is a stranger; he is profane; he is an enemy. He can no longer have God for his Father, who has not the Church for his Mother. If anyone could escape who was outside the ark of Noah, then he also may escape who shall be outside the Church..... Christ Himself, in His gospel warns us, and teaches, saying, 'and there shall be one flock and one shepherd,' and does anyone believe that in one place there can be either many shepherds or many flocks?.....Such an one is to be turned away from and avoided, whosoever he may be, that is separated from the Church. Such an one is perverted and sins, and is condemned of his own self. Does he think that he has Christ, who acts in opposition to Christ's priests, who separates himself from the company of His

clergy and people? He bears arms against the Church, he contends against God's appointment. An enemy of the altar, a rebel against Christ's sacrifice, faithless instead of believing, profane instead of religious, a disobedient servant, a son without affection, a hostile brother, despising the Bishops and forsaking God's priests, he dares to set up another altar, to make another prayer with unauthorized words, to profane the truth of the Lord's offering by false sacrifices, and not to know that he who strives against the appointments of God, is punished on account of the daring of his temerity by Divine visitation."

No one can misunderstand what this means; and it is obvious that here St. Cyprian is elaborating no mere theory of Church authority, or priesthood, or episcopacy; he is thoroughly practical. It would have seemed to him monstrous and absurd to call men to the Church if he could not have told them precisely where and what the Church was. A man's *home* is far more spiritual than material. There can be no true home without affection and self-sacrifice. It does not consist merely in the four walls of a particular habitation. But none the less for that is each man's home in some particular house; and if he wishes to introduce a stranger to his mother and his brothers he knows exactly where to find them. In like manner to doubt that, in the most real sense, the Church of Christ was visible, would have seemed to Cyprian mere insanity. To make it visible and unmistakable, a city set on a hill which could not be hid, a city at unity with itself, was the very purpose of the sacraments and of an Apostolic ministry. The people of God might be scattered over the face of the earth, but the Church herself was one; and whether in Syria or Egypt, Carthage or Rome, men might find the very same Church by the very same signs, the same ministry, the same doctrine, the same sacraments, the same Lord, the same Spirit, and a carefully protected but most generous and brotherly communion.

I need not remind you how very far removed is the public opinion of the modern "religious world" from the simplicity

of Cyprian. But we must not suffer our widely-altered, our violently contrasted circumstances and habits of thought to prevent our appreciating the single-hearted courage and practical wisdom of Cyprian. For him the task was not to restore the unity of the Church, but to preserve it. He was elevated by acclamation, and even by a kind of loving compulsion, both to the priesthood and the episcopate, within one or two years after his conversion. We need not be surprised to learn that there were some who resented his elevation and resisted his authority. They were probably not so bad as he thought they were, and Cyprian himself was not without his faults. But his opponents produced great confusion in his diocese and province, and encouraged to the utmost, later on, the schism of Novatian in the Church of Rome. They did all they could to relax the discipline of the Church of Carthage, and are accused by Cyprian of the grossest immoralities, drunkenness, for instance, and adultery. Even in the midst of persecution by the heathen they weakened by their insubordination and inconsistencies, the tone of Christian character. They divided the forces which, even when united, were barely strong enough to resist the powers that were combined for their destruction. In his own diocese and province Cyprian found that schism meant false doctrine and bad life. And we must remember that, in the middle of the third century, Christianity was still young. The Apostolic tradition had to be guarded with the most anxious care. Only by united effort could the original truth and discipline of the Gospel be either ascertained or transmitted. We know not what may be possible to Almighty God, but so far as we can learn of the ordinary methods of human action, nothing could have preserved Christianity through the perils of its early history and through the disintegration of the Roman Empire, but precisely that solid and uncompromising organization—that Unity of the Church—for which Cyprian contended so heroically, and which found its completest expression in the supremacy of the See of Rome.

"The great triumph of Cyprian," says Dr. Lightfoot, in his *Dissertation on the Christian Ministry*, in his most valuable edition of St. Paul's "Epistle to the Philippians,"¹ "was the triumph of this principle, that the existence of the Episcopal Office was not a matter of practical advantage or ecclesiastical rule or even of Apostolic sanction, but an absolute incontrovertible decree of God Of his conception of the Episcopal Office generally this much may be said here, that he regards the Bishop as exclusively the representative of God to the congregation, and hardly, if at all, as the representative of the congregation before God. The Bishop is the indispensable channel of Divine grace, the indispensable bond of the Christian brotherhood. The episcopate is not so much the roof as the foundation-stone of the ecclesiastical edifice; not so much the legitimate development as the primary condition of a Church. The Bishop is appointed directly by God, is responsible directly to God, is inspired directly from God For all practical ends the independent supremacy of the episcopate was completely established by the principles and the measures of Cyprian."

We must not forget that it was upon this independent supremacy of the episcopate and not upon any monarchical supremacy of the Bishop of Rome that St. Cyprian believed the Unity of the Church was built. He allowed, of course, that St. Peter had received a sort of primacy among the Apostles themselves, and he sometimes speaks of the Bishop of Rome as if by virtue of his office he inherited a similar primacy among his brother Bishops. Moreover, he confounds the Imperial with the Ecclesiastical dignity of Rome, and can scarcely help regarding as the very centre of the Church that august city which was also the centre of the world. To that great city Christian people flocked from every corner of the Roman Empire, bringing with

¹Lightfoot, "Philippians." pp. 238-242. Second London Edition.

them from the remotest provinces and dioceses those venerable traditions, both of doctrine and practice, which had been handed down to them from the beginning.¹ Moreover, already there was apparent a tendency towards centralization in the government of the Church which became stronger and stronger amid the calamities and disorders by which the mighty power of Rome was so soon to be broken to pieces. But though the language of St. Cyprian as to the Roman See is sometimes unguarded and even extravagant, he was far too familiar with the New Testament to mistake the primacy of St. Peter among the Apostles for a supremacy of jurisdiction. Thus, in the Epistle to Quintus, concerning the baptism of heretics,² he says: "Neither did Peter, whom first the Lord chose, and upon whom He built His Church, when Paul disputed with him afterwards about circumcision, claim anything to himself insolently, nor arrogantly assume anything: so as to say that he held the primacy, and that he ought specially to be obeyed by novices and those lately come." And even in his treatise *On the Unity of the Church*, in which especially he represents the primacy of St. Peter as the one beginning and peculiar type of that unity, he affirms in express terms that "assuredly the rest of the Apostles were also the same as was St. Peter endowed with a like partnership both of honor and power."³ Whether the Bishop of Rome is in any effective sense the successor of St. Peter, and whether that Apostle's special prerogatives were official or only personal, are separate and very wide questions. But nobody pretends to claim more for the See of Rome than could have been claimed by St. Peter himself, and that he possessed an infallibility which was not granted to St. James or St. Paul, or that he had power to depose St. John, is as remote from the teaching of St. Cyprian as it is contradictory of the

¹ Irenæus, iii., 2. Compare Neander's Note: History of the Christian Church, i, 204.

² Epistle, lxx.

³ On the Unity of the Church, 4, (i., 380).

history of the Apostles in the New Testament. Moreover the controversy in which St. Cyprian was so long and so earnestly engaged, as to the baptism of heretics seeking admission to the Catholic Church, is absolutely conclusive not only of his own belief, but of the belief of the whole African Church—a belief upon which they persistently and unwaveringly acted—that the Bishop of Rome had no authority whatever over that portion of the Church Catholic over which the Bishop of Carthage presided. Into the details of this controversy I have neither space nor is it necessary to enter. It is enough to observe that the Bishop of Rome and the Bishop of Carthage took opposite sides. It never occurred to St. Cyprian to appeal to Stephen, who was the Roman Bishop at that time, for an authoritative statement of the matter in dispute. On the contrary, he writes to him in the following terms: "We have thought it necessary for the arranging of certain matters, dearest brother, and for their investigation by the examination of a common council,¹ at which many priests were assembled at once:" and he concludes his letter thus: "We have brought these things, dearest brother, to your knowledge, for the sake of our mutual honor and sincere affection; believing that, according to the truth of your religion and faith, those things which are no less religious than true will be approved by you. But we know that some will not lay aside what they have once imbibed, and do not easily change their purpose; but, keeping fast the bond of peace and concord among their colleagues, retain certain things peculiar to themselves, which have once been adopted among them. In which behalf we neither do violence to nor impose a law upon any one, since each prelate has in the administration of the Church the exercise of his will free, as he shall give an account of his conduct to the Lord."

The language of St. Cyprian at the seventh council of

¹ Epistle lxxi. Pope Stephen. To gather together and hold a council.

Carthage over which he presided A. D. 256, is even more emphatic and conclusive. At that council eighty-seven bishops were assembled, who all agreed with St. Cyprian, not only in holding, but in maintaining St. Cyprian's opinion on the nullity of baptism administered by heretics. In that opinion we are justified by later authoritative decisions and by the now uniform practice of the Catholic Church in affirming that they were all mistaken. But perhaps this very fact brings out into greater prominence their perfect independence of the jurisdiction of the Roman See. They not only failed to ask for, but they emphatically repudiate, any decision or interference from the Bishop of Rome. After sundry letters had been read to his assembled colleagues, Cyprian said: "You have heard, my dearly beloved colleagues, what Jubaianus our co-bishop has written to me, taking counsel of my poor intelligence concerning the unlawful and profane baptism of heretics, as well as what I wrote in answer to him It remains that upon this same matter each of us should bring forward what we think, judging no man, nor rejecting any one from the right of communion, if he should think differently from us. For neither does any of us set himself up as a bishop of bishops, nor by tyrannical terror does any one compel his colleague to the necessity of obedience; since every bishop, according to the allowance of his liberty and power, has his own proper right of judgment, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another. But let us all wait for the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the only one that has the power both of preferring us in the government of His Church and of judging us in our conduct there."

WILLIAM KIRKUS.

[CONCLUDED IN THE NEXT NUMBER.]

SERMON

ON THE ELECTION OF A BISHOP.¹

"Set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city."—Titus i; 5.

We are assembled here this day to perform one of the most solemn and important duties which can be required of a council of the Church—the election of one to be a Bishop. It is a weighty responsibility imposed upon us of choosing a fit successor to those men of God who have filled this See and now rest from their labors—the self-denying, prudent, patient Croes; the wide-planning, hardworking, "right-onward" Doane; the loving, priestly, pure-minded Odenheimer. New Jersey has been blessed in her Bishops; and under their administration, by the Divine help, the Church in this State has largely grown. It has been my privilege to have known all three, and to watch that growth. Baptised in infancy by the first Bishop of the Diocese, I

¹*To the Rev. E. B. Boggs, D. D.*

DEAR BROTHER:—Believing that the sermon on the Qualifications of a Bishop, preached by you before our late Special Convention, called to elect a Bishop for Northern New Jersey, ought to have a wider circulation, we request of you that you will print it in the CHURCH REVIEW, believing that it will add to the value of that publication.

Your Brethren in the Church,

JOSEPH H. SMITH,
GEORGE C. PENNELL,
ROBERT N. MERRITT,
T. A. STARKEY,
W. T. WEBBE,
And others.

still retain a vague memory of a tall, venerable figure, dressed like a gentleman of olden time. Bishop Croes was respected by all, in and out of the Church. His work was to lay the foundations. It was not and could not be a showy work. With very inadequate means, barely removed from poverty, yet always "ready to give;" doing the work of a Rector in one of the chief towns, as well as that of a Bishop; and obliged to contend with all the popular prejudices engendered by the revolution (the Episcopal Church being then often, by way of reproach, called the English); confronted on every side by ignorance of the true claims and nature of the Church; his task was a hard one, and the wonder is not that he accomplished so little, but that he was able to do so much. He commanded for himself, his office, and his Church, the entire respect of the community; he laid the foundation of Churchmanship on which others have builded. He took charge of the Diocese in 1816. In the first Convention in which he presided as Bishop, the number of clergy belonging to the Diocese was eight, and twelve Parishes were represented, reporting 583 communicants; 115 persons were confirmed in the first year. In 1832, the year of his death, the number of clergymen was 21; and 16 parishes were represented; but there were 31 congregations; communicants, about 800.

I have spoken at more length of our first Bishop because his work is less known to most of you, and, being more quiet, has not been fully appreciated. Of his successors I need not speak. Their work is so well known to the clergy and laity of New Jersey that I will not dwell upon it. Suffice it to say, that under the administration of Bishop Doane the number of clergy had increased, in 1858, to 92. There were 71 Parishes in union with the Convention, and the confirmations reported for that year (ending May, 1858) were 572.

Of our late beloved Bishop, it is the less necessary that I should speak, because his memorial has been already so well made before you, by one better qualified. Taking up the

work where Doane had left it, Odenheimer earnestly carried it on; going in and out among the churches, harmonizing and unifying, until he saw the time had come when by God's blessing, giving the increase, the work had become too great for one bishop to superintend, the little flock had become "two bands." In 1874 a division was made, and now we have in this State two Dioceses, the Southern retaining the old revered name of NEW JERSEY, having, as reported to their Convention in May last, 88 clergymen, 618 confirmed, 7,140 communicants, and 72 parishes in union with the Convention. And this, our new Diocese of NORTHERN NEW JERSEY, reporting 76 clergymen, 845 confirmed, 7,786 communicants, and 66 parishes. Thus in the whole State, in less than fifty years, the increase has been from 21 to 164 clergymen, from 31 to 138 parishes, not counting missions, 1,463 were confirmed last year, and the communicants have increased from about 800 to nearly 15,000. What great cause have we for thankfulness to the Great Head of the Church, who has given this increase.

In the providence of God it was ordered that when Bishop Odenheimer selected for himself this new Diocese, his health was so broken that he was unable at once to take charge thereof; and though foreign travel and rest restored it so far that he was afterwards able to do the routine work of confirming and ordaining, yet it was entirely out of his power to inaugurate new measures. It remains for the Bishop you are now to elect to investigate fully the needs of the Diocese, to map out and press forward its missionary work, to organize new enterprises and stir up all, clergy and laity, to new zeal in the Master's cause. There is a glorious future before this Church, if only with united hearts and shoulder to shoulder we go at our work. Hence, the vast importance that laying aside party feeling, and even personal preferences, we should unite on one who we may have good reason to believe is well-fitted for the responsible position of *Episcopus*, overseer.

It is the Divine commission, received from Christ

through the Apostles and their successors in the ministerial office, which gives the Bishop his authority, makes him, as St. Paul's says, an "Ambassador for Christ." This commission your election cannot bestow. You may select a man agreeable to yourselves, and ask that he may be set over you in the Lord, but you cannot make him God's Ambassador. For consecration to the Episcopal Office of the man you may elect, you and he must apply to those who, as the Article says, "have public authority given unto them to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard," *i. e.*, those who are already Bishops; and he, thus consecrated and thereby commissioned, becomes not only your Bishop, but a Bishop of the Catholic Church, one of a body or college of Bishops, responsible to a certain extent for the welfare of the whole Church, with special responsibility for that portion thereof committed to his jurisdiction. I need not dwell upon this, I remind you of it that you may feel more deeply the great importance of a right selection. Not this Diocese alone, but the whole Church is interested in your choice. Your Bishop is to be a permanent legislator, a guardian of the faith, a commander of one division of Christ's army for the conquest of the world. Armies are made up of various divisions; each brigade has its allotted place and work; its general must see that every officer is efficient and at his post, that the men are cared for, fed, armed and drilled, etc., but all this to fit his division to act in concert with others under the commander-in-chief, for the common cause. The army of Christ is not only one of occupation, but of conquest, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel," was spoken to the whole Church, to the Bishop of Northern New Jersey just as much as to the first Apostles. For convenience sake, to avoid confusion, we make a distinction between Missionary and Diocesan Bishops, but in reality there is none. The man whom you are now to elect, when duly consecrated, will become an Apostle, one sent, a Missionary, first and chiefly to his own Diocese, but also, according to his oppor-

tunity, "to all the world," and, therefore, bound to take an interest in the general preservation of the Church's doctrine and discipline, in its extension, in every labor of Christian love, at home and abroad. But while this is most true, and the qualifications of learning, experience and soundness in the faith, needed for this are to be kept in view, yet it is in his own Diocese, the chief work of the Bishop must be done; and he who is most earnest and successful in his own jurisdiction will, as a rule, be most weighty in the general councils of the Church, and most useful in its general work.

In his own Diocese, to use the words of Hooker, the Bishop "has not only power of administering the word and the sacraments, but also a further power to ordain ecclesiastical persons, and a power of chieftly in government over presbyters as well as laymen; a power to be by way of jurisdiction a Pastor even to Pastors themselves."

There are certain popular errors among both clergy and laity in regard to a Bishop's work and jurisdiction, a setting forth and refutation of which may aid us in understanding what these really are, better, perhaps, than can be done more directly in the time at our disposal.

1. A Bishop is not a mere routine official for preaching, ordaining and confirming. Yet some appear to think so; and if a Bishop spend two or three hours in a parish, preach a sermon on some usual topic, and confirm the candidates; shake hands after service with such happy individuals as may be able to approach him; bid a hurried "God bless you" to the Rector, jump into the carriage to meet another engagement, often two, the same day, they think he has performed the Episcopal duty of a Parochial visitation. So wide-spread is this notion that it requires some courage in a Bishop to break through the miserable custom. It has rendered the Bishop's visits of far less permanent value than they might be made. The custom has arisen from, and also helped to keep alive, that congregational spirit which is the bane of this Church. What would be thought of a general who was satisfied with

so superficial an inspection of his army as this amounts to? What real information as to the condition of his Diocese can a Bishop obtain from such hurried visitations? That such a rapid "passing by" is not what the Church intends by an Episcopal Visitation is shown by Title I., Canon 15, § XI., of the Digest, which orders: "Every Bishop in this Church shall visit the Churches within his Diocese at least once in three years, for the purpose of *examining the state of his Church, inspecting the behaviour of his clergy*, administering the apostolic rite of confirmation, ministering the Word, and if he think fit, administering the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper *to the people committed to his charge.*" And in Canon 14, § IV. [2], it is plainly taught, that with the notice to be given by the Bishop of each visitation, there shall also be sent questions addressed to the minister, and to the warden, and vestrymen, regarding "*the state of the congregation,*" which they are required then to answer for his "*information.*" We cannot think this is fulfilled by the "reports to the Convention," for which order is given in *another Canon*. Now I would have you note the italicised words of the first Canon quoted. In it the Diocese is called "his," i. e., the Bishop's "*Church.*" The whole people therein are said to be "*committed to his charge.*" He is thus declared responsible for the spiritual instruction and supervision of ALL, *laity* as well as clergy. I would beg you especially to mark this, brethren of the laity, for it combats another error, viz.: that the jurisdiction of the Bishop is chiefly, if not solely, over the clergy. You are ready enough to admit the subordination of the clergy to their Bishop, you are not quite so willing to allow that of yourselves. If the clergy offend you in any way, you are quick to appeal against them to their Bishop, and think they ought gladly to obey "his Godly admonitions;" but how is it if you give cause of offence to them and they ask the Bishop to protect them, and he admonish you?

And now let me endeavor to depicture a visitation of the Bishop, if fully carried out as I believe the Church intends

it should be; not, perhaps, every time he comes to a parish, but at least, once in three years.

He comes into a parish not as a spy, not to gossip or hear tales on either side, but as a Father in God, in his Master's name and by virtue of his Master's commission, "to examine the state of his Church." Notice has been sent beforehand to rector and vestry of certain heads on which he requires information; such as, from the rector: How many services and of what kind are held? How many attendants usually at such services? What care is taken for the instruction of the children in the doctrines and discipline of the Church? What missionary work is going on for parish enlargement, or Church extension? What errors of doctrine or discipline seem to be threatening the souls of your people, etc.? And then from the vestry: What is the financial condition of your parish? What the salary of your rector, and is it paid? What the condition of your church property? What are you doing to help your rector in his work—parochial and missionary? What for Diocesan and general missions, etc.?

This premised, let us suppose the Bishop to arrive at the rectory, which, as a rule, should be his home, on the Saturday early enough to have a few hours private consultation with the rector, when the subjects alluded to may be talked over, such advice or encouragement given as may seem fitting, and the blessing of the Master sought by prayer. In the evening the wardens or vestry are met, the rector being present if he so desire, and information received on the heads committed to them; advice, exhortation or encouragement given; in fact the whole "state of the Church" examined, according to the Canon. This might be followed by a social gathering of the congregation, that the Bishop may gain some personal knowledge of "the people committed to his charge,"

Sunday morning would come the "ministering of the Word and Sacraments." The sermon, a father's word to his flock, a feeding of Christ's sheep, inspired, perhaps, by

what he has just learned of the needs of the parish, or instruction and exhortation on some important point of doctrine and discipline; or on some practical Diocesan work that he knows ought to be pushed—in short, a sermon fitted for the occasion—differing somewhat from ordinary parish preaching.

“Feed my lambs,” said our Lord. Oh, let the afternoon be given to the children, that they may feel the Bishop cares for them; that they may grow up to love him and look forward to his visits with joy, and long for the time when their pastor can say, ‘you are now duly prepared, come, that I may present you for the laying on of the hands of your Bishop.’ Oh, what influence for good a Bishop may have who loves children. Well do I remember how the children in a former parish, looked forward to, and prepared by study, for the visit of Bishop Doane; who, to his honor be it said, however hurried, never neglected to catechise the children, and well he did it.

The evening service would be for confirmation. The sermon more general in character, yet instructive in Church doctrine and gospel truth; with a special loving word of encouragement to the confirmed, and of exhortation to others, thus fitly rounding out the service. Nor need the Bishop hasten away at the earliest possible moment, but, guided by the wish of the rector, sometimes remain for other services, for missionary exploration of the neighborhood, or for any other work, public or private.

To some, all this may appear utopian, and some rectors would object to such investigation. Of course, great discretion is to be used, nor, as already said, need all this be done at every visit. But who does not feel that such a visit as this, prudently carried on, would stir up minister and people and leave an impression for good which would be felt through long time, would not only help the parish, but also give the Bishop an intimate knowledge of the wants of his Diocese; where and how to work. But, oh, who is sufficient for these things! What zeal, what self-

denial, what earnest piety, what prudence, what study, what prayer, to fit for this. No novice, no busy-body, no worldly-minded, no weak-hearted, no cold-blooded man could attempt this. It needs one filled with the Divine Spirit of love, one "wise as serpents and harmless as doves." These are the qualities needed in a Bishop.

But besides the visitations to organized parishes, the Bishop is also to be the chief missionary of his Diocese. It is his to seek for Christ's sheep which are scattered abroad. Where there are no parishes, there is especially the Bishop's parish.¹ I do not mean that he himself is always to go first to such places and inaugurate services, he might not have time for this. But he is to have care for them, to send out those in whom he has confidence, to explore and report; he should know thoroughly, the condition, wants and capabilities of such places, and thus be able to avoid mistakes, wastes of men and money. For this purpose he should have a band of assistants, young men, ministers and candidates for orders, whom he could send where found most needed, through whom he could work—his military family, so to speak—supported from a Diocesan Fund, associated together as a band of workers. And here we have the true idea of the cathedral as a practical thing, the centre of the Diocese—whence the Bishop

¹I am glad to be able to quote the opinion of a distinguished layman of this Diocese, Cortlandt Parker, Esq., to the same effect. "So far as regards unoccupied territory this power and duty of actively promoting Church extension belong by necessary implication to the Bishop. He is the chief Pastor, charged with the duty of looking over the entire field, and of gathering in the wandering, unfolded sheep. All baptised into the Church and residents within his Diocese belong to his charge, and cannot separate themselves from it. * * * To the Bishop of each Diocese, therefore, belongs *ex necessitate rei* the duty of establishing Churches, Congregations and Parishes where now there are none. * * * As human nature is, some one should have the right of determining when a given population demands or will justify a new Church. And that person should be the Bishop, unless indeed that great office is only to be regarded as a convenience for ordination and confirmation."—*Opinion, etc.*

works its missions, with its clergy-house, schools, libraries and charities, clustering around the Bishop's seat. The church-building a part of the system, not the whole, wherein from time to time he may gather the clergy for conference, and also either himself or by learned deputy, perform that other important duty of driving away from the Church all unsound doctrine and of teaching the truth in its fullness.

And this again brings into prominence another qualification of a Bishop; a sufficiency of sound learning and a steadfastness in the faith. These are times of shifting opinions and changing faiths. The Church is set as a light in the world. To extinguish this light of Divine truth she is assailed on the one side "by oppositions of science falsely so called," which would take from her all that is of faith—the very spiritual life—and leave her in the darkness of a cold materialism; and on the other, a spurious catholicity would take from her all exercise of the reasoning powers, and envelop her in the mists of superstition. An important duty of a Bishop is to warn his Church of these dangers and see that her light be kept burning clear and strong. This requires in him a cultured mind, exercised not only in theological, but also in a certain degree of general learning; and above all, a steadfastness of faith, based upon a knowledge of Church history, and especially on an intimate acquaintance with God's Holy Word, so that "his testimony of Christ shall be not yea and nay, but *yea*." A Bishop must have faith in his Divine commission; must believe in the Church as a Divine institution, as sure to succeed.

And then there is the influence the Bishop may exercise in leading young men to the ministry and aiding them to a fit preparation—but I must pause—the theme is far from exhausted—time fails. Enough has been said to show the vast importance and wide scope of the office and work of a Bishop, and how careful we should be to make choice of a fit person to serve in this sacred ministry. Who, indeed,

would dare undertake such a position were it not for the strengthening promise, "Lo, I am with you alway." No one ought to accept it who cannot feel "not I, but the grace of God."

Having said so much regarding the duties of a Bishop to his diocese, it seems proper to close by reversing the picture and saying a few words—and they can be but few—of our duty as clergy and laity towards the Bishop. An apostolic injunction says: "obey them that have the rule over you and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account; that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you." They are *ἡγεμῶνες*, leaders in God's army, of Divine, not human appointment, as such, they have a right to our obedience, under the laws of the Head of the Church by which we are all governed. "They watch for our souls," a weighty responsibility for which they deserve our sympathy and filial love. Their office demands our respect, their work claims and requires our hearty co-operation. We choose our own superior officer, he has thus an additional claim upon us for obedience, sympathy and help. However good and earnest a Bishop may be, unless his clergy and laity work with him, he can do but little. The work is heavy upon him, and as Aaron and Hur held up Moses' hands in the fight against the Amalekites, so let the clergy on the one side, and the laity on the other, hold up our Bishop's hands in the Church's fight against God's enemies. And let us remember that however divine the office, the officer is human, therefore liable to err; we must not expect perfection; we must be ready to allow for infirmities, for mistakes. If compelled to differ, let us do it kindly. Let us remember our vow to "follow with a glad mind and will his godly admonitions, and to submit ourselves to his godly judgments;" and even if we think him wrong, or going a little beyond his powers, it is better, for peace sake, unless some great principle be involved, to yield, than by opposition to stir up strife. Let us aid in

carrying out his plans for the growth of the Church, to the utmost of our ability. Not as is too often the case, requiring him to make brick without straw—withholding men and money, and then blaming him because more is not done. And above all, let us give heed to the entreaty so often uttered by the great Apostle, “brethren pray for us.” If he so felt the need of the help of the intercessions of his people, surely every Bishop must require it. Yes, let us constantly pray for God’s blessing upon our Bishop and his work.

I believe that we all have come here this day with a sincere desire to perform our duty in the fear of God, to His honor and glory, and for the edifying of His Church. We may have, as is natural and proper, our personal preferences and views, but we must not let them stand in the way of duty. We are to sign our names to a declaration that we believe in our conscience the man we elect “to be of such sufficiency in good learning, such soundness in the faith, and of such virtuous and pure manners, and godly conversation, that he is apt and meet to exercise the office of a Bishop to the honor of God, and the edifying of His Church, and to be a wholesome example of the flock of Christ.” May the Holy Spirit so preside in this our Council and so guide our choice, that we may all be able, with good will, to declare and to feel that this is the one He hath chosen.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

One of the most important subjects which will engage the attention of the next General Convention, will be the proposed division of the American Church into Provinces. It is not at all probable that any positive legislation will be effected at this session; a matter of so much importance will require very careful deliberation. But something must undoubtedly be done by way of preparation; the necessities of the case require it. There is almost universal

agreement that it will be impossible for this wide-spread and rapidly growing Church to continue much longer as if one vast Province. Some relief must be obtained, and a sub-division into provinces, is the remedy which at once occurs to every mind at all familiar with church history. So far we may say there is almost unanimous agreement. The divergencies will arise when we come to arrange the various details, as to the number and size of the Provinces and their relations to the Dioceses and to the National Church (as for convenience sake we may designate the whole of our Church in the United States). It will be seen at once, that a multiplicity of questions will occur under these two heads on which great differences of opinion must be expected. Few persons having carefully studied the subject, there will be at first a great deal of crude thinking and talking. Hence, the importance of having this whole matter fully discussed by the press, that all the light possible may be thrown upon it before the Convention meets next fall.

For this reason, as well as for its own intrinsic value, we gladly welcome the "Report on the Provincial System" made by the sub-committee of the Committee appointed by the General Convention of 1877, which has just been made public. The well-known character of the two Bishops constituting this sub-committee (Ohio and Pennsylvania) adds greatly to the importance of this report. They being of conservative tendencies, and having no pet theories to advance in regard to the subject, their report will receive the notice it deserves from men of all shades of opinion, and will be of great practical value in calling attention to the matter, and aiding in defining the especial points which need investigation. We hope before long to be able to give some history of this whole subject of provinces and our own views as to its adaptation by our Church, meanwhile we give a synopsis of this report.

1. It is very non-committal as to details, while sufficiently plain in its general recommendations. Questions were printed and sent to the Bishops, to which they were invited to return answers, but with the express declaration that no "Bishop should be considered as committing himself by these replies." This is judicious. In the present state of the question it would not be wise for any one to commit himself absolutely to any definite views.

Full replies were received from nine Bishops; indefinite ones from four; negative from three, two of these declining to consider the question. In all, fifteen Bishops expressed opinions to the sub-committee. The answers and names are not given, but the results are stated as "a drift of opinion towards agreement on the main question, and a tendency towards an establishment of Provinces, provided it will not involve all particulars of the Provincial system.' What these are is not stated, we should like to see them. The sub-committee as the result of their examination of the subject, present the following resolution, to be

RECOMMENDED TO THE GENERAL CONVENTION.

Resolved, That the following recommendations be made to the next General Convention :

1. To establish four Provinces within the territory of the United States; a Province of the Atlantic, of the Centre, of the West and of the Pacific; generally bounded by the lines of the Alleghanies, the Mississippi river, and the Rocky mountains.
2. That in all legislation respecting a Provincial system, the independence of existing Dioceses be guarded and preserved.
3. That the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America shall continue to be the Legislative body uniting the Churches, retaining the power to maintain the integrity of the Prayer Book and other Symbols, governing Provinces, and representing all the Dioceses; but restricted to general legislation.
4. That the General Convention shall meet once in nine years.

Respectfully submitted,

G. T. BEDELL,

WM. BACON STEVENS,

Sub-Committee.

October 17th, 1879.

AT HOME.

The Report of the Secretary of the Interior made at the opening of Congress, contains certain statements in regard to the Indians which are worthy of consideration, and we report some of them for future reference.

It is stated that the number of Indians in the United States is two hundred and fifty-two thousand, and of these, less than one thousand are causing any trouble. The progress of civilization and the maintenance of peace among the Indians have always gone hand in hand.

All right-minded persons must agree with the following :

"Whatever troubles and perplexities the presence of Indians among us may cause, every man who loves justice and who values the honor of the American name, will admit that it is our solemn duty to leave nothing untried to prepare a better fate than extermination and a better rule than that of brute force for the original occupants of the soil upon which so many millions of our people have grown prosperous and happy."

As regards the capabilities of the Indian for civilization, these items speak for themselves:

"According to the official statistics, the Indians on reservations are reported to have now under cultivation 157,056 acres, about 24,000 of which were broken by them this year. The products raised by the reservation Indians during the past twelve months amounted to 328,637 bushels of wheat, 643,256 bushels of corn, 189,654 bushels of oats and barley, 390,698 bushels of potatoes and other vegetables, and 48,353 tons of hay.

This exhibit does not include the products of the five civilized tribes of the Indian Territory, who cultivated 237,000 acres and raised 565,400 bushels of wheat, 2,015,000 bushels of corn, 200,500 bushels of oats and barley, 336,700 bushels of vegetables, and 176,500 tons of hay.

The raising of stock has been encouraged as much as possible. There are now owned by reservation Indians 199,700 horses, 2,870 mules, 68,894 head of cattle, 32,537 swine, and 863,525 sheep, the latter principally by the Navajoes. The five civilized tribes in the Indian territory are reported to have 45,500 horses, 5,500 mules, 272,000 head of cattle, 190,000 swine and 32,400 sheep.

The Secretary reports that the department has been very successful in employing Indians as freighters, in carrying supplies from the Missouri river back to agencies in Dakota. He says: "There are now 1,356 wagons run by Indian teamsters, and they have proved the most efficient, honest and reliable freighters the Indian service ever had. Not a pound of freight was ever lost."

He also reports satisfying progress in education. There are now 7,193 children of the *uncivilized tribes* attending school, an increase of 964 over last year. A large school for Indian pupils is in successful operation in the old military barracks at Carlisle, Penn., where 158 boys and girls are being taught, children of prominent men in various tribes. A similar one is to be established at Forest Grove, Oregon. These are encouraging facts, and should induce us to make renewed efforts for our Indian Missions.

AMONG THE BOOKS.

EARLY CHRONICLERS OF EUROPE. ENGLAND. *By James Gairdner.* pp. 328. \$1.50. FRANCE. *By Gustave Masson, B. A.,* pp. 370. \$1.50. LONDON: SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE. NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co.

Nuts are not very attractive when placed before us in all their original hardness of shell, but if some one will crack them and lay them open, and make the meat easy of extraction, then they are

by no means bad eating. But with certain kinds of nuts it needs hard cracks to break the shell, and strong picks to get out the meat. So it is with some kinds of books; very uninviting to the ordinary reader, if not absolutely repulsive, yet they contain much valuable and interesting matter under this hard exterior. But some one must exercise the skill and the practice required to crack the nut and extract the meat, before the general reader can get the good that is in them.

Now this is just what has been done for us in these books we have before us. Few readers are aware how much we are indebted for historical information to these old chronicles, or how much of interesting matter is found in them regarding mediæval history. Doubtless, careless readers often wonder how the writers of pleasant histories of England and France find out all the particulars they give of events and manners and customs. They little think of the hard study of dry old chronicles to which they owe these pleasant readings, with their curious information. It is well worth their while to look at these two volumes, and learn something of the sources of history. Written in barbarous Latin, or obsolete English and French, it is only when persevering toil and judicious learning select the interesting passages and give translations, that the value of these old writings is appreciated, and we are made to feel the debt of gratitude we owe to old Monks, who, in the solitude of the monastery, continued year after year to note down all they could collect from various sources, of the events of their own times and of those that were before. These volumes give a connected account of them and their writings in chronological order, down to the beginning of what may be called modern history. The English to the time of Hall and Holinshed, the French to the fifteenth century. Nor are they dry reading, as from the subject might be inferred; we can say for our own part, that we have read many novels with far less interest. Not merely the names and some account of the chroniclers are given, but sketches of the times in which they lived and well chosen extracts from their works, affording us a good idea of style and matter. It adds greatly to the interest and value of the book on France, that while in the text these extracts are translated, the original Latin, English or French are given in foot notes, thus enabling the reader to notice the changes which the languages have undergone in the course of long years. To give our readers some idea of the curious and interesting information contained in these books, as to the state of society in the "Middle Ages," we quote the following account of one of the plays called *Soties*, acted by young men of good family, who called themselves *enfants sans soucy*; the purpose of these farces being "to hold up to ridicule the different orders of society, and to state with considerable freedom what the public thought of their rulers." The play is

question was composed by Pierre Gringore, who flourished during the fifteenth century, under the reign of Louis XII, and was "brought out, at the Paris Market-place during the carnival of 1511, in the presence of the king, the parliament, the town councillors and the whole of the population." It was called the *Jeu du Prince des Sots*, the subject-matter being "the opposition between the pope and the king, the temporal and the spiritual powers."

Two characters appear as the antagonists, namely: the *Prince des Sots* (the king) and *La Mère Sotte* (the Church), each surrounded by his court. The great object for both of them is to secure the countenance and support of a third personage, *Sotte Commune*; that is to say, the nation, the commonalty of the realm. They are attached to the Church, as good Catholics should be; means must be devised to alienate them from the pope, and win them over to the king. By way of preface, we have first a dialogue between two or three *sots*, who discourse freely about the events of the day. * * By degrees the stage begins to fill; the king and his court arrive, and the conversation turns upon the prelates, whose vices, ignorance, treachery and fickleness are violently denounced. *Sotte Commune* joins in: What careth it for all the wars, treaties, conquests, alliances and treacheries which are made so much of? Of what consequence is it that the chair of St. Peter should be occupied by a fool or a wise man? All that the commonalty require is peace, the opportunity of earning an honest living and the assurance of not being ruined by an edict which alters the currency. *Mère Sotte* (the Church) then interferes, attempting first to win over by the most brilliant promises, the dignitaries of the Gallican Church; having so far succeeded, she tries, but in vain, to secure the assistance of the lay lords for the cause of ultramontaniam. Defeated in this instance, *Mère Sotte* draws the sword, becomes *gend' arme*, and orders the prelates to fight manfully on the side of Rome. In the midst of the general confusion, *Sotte Commune* (the commonalty) goes over to the king's party, being duly cautioned that *Mère Sotte* is not the Church, but a counterfeit power, which, under the mask of religion, troubles consciences and endangers the peace of Christendom.

We at first thought that of the two volumes that on England would be of most interest; but when we turned to that on France, we found ourselves unable to decide. Our advice is, read both, and thank us for telling you to do it.

THE BEAUTIFUL FACE. A Tale by Elizabeth Harcourt Mitchell.
NEW YORK. POTT, YOUNG & Co. pp. 268.

If boys and girls, yes, and grown people, wish to know something of how boys and girls lived in the olden times in England, just after the Norman conquest, let them read this book. They will not only find in it a good deal of such information, but also a very interesting story, combined with excellent religious and moral teaching. If inclined to criticise, we might say that the language put into the mouths of the children is rather above their position. But as the author tells us that she has not given their own words, which would not be understood by modern readers, but her own version thereof, we may excuse it. Apart from this, the book is well written; and will be a welcome holiday gift to either girl or boy.

THE SETTLER AND THE SAVAGE. *A Tale of Peace and War in South Africa.* By R. M. Ballantyne, with Illustrations. NEW YORK. POTT, YOUNG & Co. pp. 421.

This is something more than a boy's book of adventures, of hunts of wild beasts and fights with savages, of hair-breadth escapes, by flood and field. It has all these in plenty, enough to satisfy the most voracious appetite. But besides, it gives an account of the settlement of the eastern part of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope, by "the landing of the British settlers in the year 1820," with the difficulties they encountered and the wars with the Kafirs. The adventures of "Charlie Consindine" and his Dutch friends, introduce very naturally, the history of these events; so that a great deal of information is given about the natural history of the country, the manners of the natives, and the history of the colonists. These are so blended with the tale, that no reader will be tempted to skip. Thus instruction and amusement are pleasantly combined.

A YEAR AT BRIERCLIFFE. By F. M'Cready Harris (*Hope Led-yard*). NEW YORK. THOMAS WHITTAKER, 1879. pp. 189.

A simple story of school-girl life. Kate Kimball goes to "Briercliffe Institution for young ladies and children" (the name shows it is an American story) as pupil and assistant teacher, the latter, in order that she may learn needed lessons of self-control. While there is nothing very original in the trials she meets with, how could there be, yet they interest. And religious teaching is conveyed throughout the story in a natural, and therefore, useful way, we mean inculcated by the events, and without any preaching.

THE FAITH OF OUR FOREFATHERS. By the Rev. Edward J. Stearns, D.D. *Second Edition, Revised.* NEW YORK. THOMAS WHITTAKER, 1879. pp. 380.

It speaks well for the value of this book that a new edition has been so soon called for. Works of this controversial character are not generally popular. We understand there has been a large demand for it in Baltimore and New Orleans; showing that it is of use where most needed. To this new edition a note has been added on the last page, "on the Immaculate Conception." We give a specimen of the curious logic of Archbishop Gibbons, quoted in this note:

"It is worthy of note, that as three characters appear on the scene of our fall, Adam, Eve and the rebellious Angel, so three corresponding personages figured in our redemption; Jesus Christ, who is the second Adam (i. Cor. 15: 45); Mary, who is the second Eve, and the Archangel Gabriel. The second Adam was immeasurably superior to the first, Gabriel was superior to the fallen angel, and hence we are warranted by analogy, to conclude that Mary was superior to Eve. But if she had been created in original sin, instead of being superior, she would be inferior to Eve, who was certainly created immaculate."

In reply, our author says: "There is no 'analogy' between the two. Eve was the *wife* of Adam, not his mother." Eve was the type of the Church; and he sets against the Archbishop this from Augustine: 'Parentes qui nos genuerunt ad mortem, Adam est et Eva; parentes qui nos genuerunt ad vitam, Christus est et Ecclesia; i. e. The parents who begat us to death, are Adam and Eve; the parents who begat us to life, are Christ and the Church.'

This second edition is printed on much heavier paper, but with the exception of the note just mentioned, is identical with the first. It is a useful book for the clergy to have on hand.

STORIES EXPLANATORY OF THE CHURCH CATECHISM. *By Mrs. Sherwood.* NEW YORK. THOMAS WHITTAKER, 1879. pp. 331.

There are some books which never seem to grow old; and from the numerous editions through which it has passed (this being from the twenty-fifth London edition of 1851), this must be one of them. It carries us back to our childish days, to read once more about the Barracks, and Sergeant and Mrs. Browne, and their God-daughter Mary. There are few books which better explain for children the meaning of the catechism than this; while its quaint style, and out-of-the-way stories of eastern life help to fix its lessons in the memory.

FAMILY PRAYERS. *Prepared by a Committee of the Upper House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury. Published by Authority of the House.* NEW YORK. E. P. DUTTON & Co., 1879. pp. 128.

The English Prayer book contains no form for Family Prayers, one was added to our own. Though a great number of books of Family Worship have been published, yet it seems that there is felt to be a need of one duly authorized by the Church. The Convocation of Canterbury accordingly, has taken the subject into consideration and appointed a Committee of Bishops to draw up a "Manual of Family Prayers," the Bishop of Exeter being chairman. This little book is set forth by them, "to be tested by use and experience prior to its final and formal adoption."

THE CHURCH ALMANAC FOR THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1880. No. L. *Edited by Wm. G. Farrington, D.D.* NEW YORK: THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL TRACT SOCIETY. POTT, YOUNG & Co.

WHITTAKER'S CHURCHMAN'S ALMANAC. THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL ALMANAC AND CHURCH DIRECTORY FOR THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1880. NEW YORK: T. WHITTAKER.